

## ABOUT PEP

PEP (Political and Economic Planning) is an independent, non-party organisation. Since 1931, when it was formed, PEP has acted as a bridge between research on the one hand and policy-making on the other, whether in government, the social services, or industry. Its aim is a practical one: to study problems of public concern, to find out the facts, to present them impartially, to suggest ways in which the knowledge can be applied.

PEP derives its income primarily from subscriptions made by industry, commerce, and private individuals, from grants made by educational trusts, and from the sales of its publications. A pamphlet, *About PEP*, which gives the composition of the Council of Management and fuller details about objects, organisation, and finance, will be sent free on application to 16 Queen Anne's Gate, London, S.W.1.

ADVISORY  
COMMITTEES IN  
BRITISH  
GOVERNMENT

1960

P E P  
16 QUEEN ANNE'S GATE  
GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD  
40 MUSEUM STREET  
LONDON

# CONTENTS

	<i>page</i>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
INTRODUCTION	xi
<div style="float: left; font-size: 2em; margin-right: 20px;">2337</div> <div> <div style="text-align: right; margin-bottom: 10px;">PART ONE: GENERAL</div> <div>Chapter</div> </div>	
I THE DEVELOPMENT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES	1
Early committees	1
Modern advisory committees	3
The growth of advisory committees	9
2 GENERAL REVIEW	12
Three main types	14
Problems of definition	18
Statutory committees	21
Committees by departments	22
Economic and industrial committees	24
Social service committees	28
Defence committees	31
Scientific committees	31
Colonial committees	32
Other committees	33
Scottish committees	34
3 PROBLEMS OF COMPOSITION	35
Methods of recruitment	36
Relations of members with outside groups	42

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
Other aids to effectiveness	44
Size and service	51
Plurality of membership	53
Members of Parliament	58
<b>4 METHODS OF WORK</b>	<b>61</b>
Structure and methods	61
Making progress	69
Results	77
<b>5 THE FUNCTIONS AND INFLUENCE OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES</b>	<b>83</b>
Committees and informal advice	83
The position of interest groups	91
The power of specialists	94
The effectiveness of advisory committees	96
Wider aspects	103

## PART TWO: SPECIAL STUDIES

### *Special Study*

<b>I ADVISORY COMMITTEES FOR SCOTLAND AND WALES</b>	<b>115</b>
Specialised committees	115
The Highlands and Islands	121
The Council for Wales and Monmouthshire	125
<b>II FIFTEEN MAJOR COMMITTEES</b>	<b>132</b>
National Production Advisory Council on Industry	133
Economic Planning Board	137
National Joint Advisory Council	140

<i>Special Study</i>	<i>page</i>
Consultative Committee for Industry	143
Engineering Advisory Council	145
Agricultural Improvement Council for England and Wales	148
Advisory Council on Scientific Policy	152
Advisory Council on Scientific Research and Technical Development	155
Central Housing Advisory Committee	159
National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers	163
Central Health Services Council	167
National Insurance Advisory Committee	171
Television Advisory Committee	174
Burnham Committees	177
Colonial Research Council	181
 III THE INFLUENCE OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES: TWO EXAMPLES	 186
The work of the Engineering Advisory Council, 1955-58	186
A report of the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers, 1953-55	188
 IV MAJOR NOMINATING BODIES	 193
Industrial organisations	193
Other national organisations	196
 V ADVISORY COMMITTEES IN 1958	 198
INDEX	218

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

THIS study was made possible by a grant from the Leverhulme Trust, for whose generous help P E P is very grateful. The work was supervised by a Group meeting at P E P from 1957 to 1959. A great deal of assistance in the research was received from civil servants, from many national organisations, and from individuals with experience of advisory committees; in particular the study owes a great deal to the help of Miss E. L. Smart, M.B.E., of the Machinery of Government branch of the Treasury, in making arrangements for the research. The responsibility for the accuracy of the facts and for the views expressed, of course, lies entirely with P E P and not with any official or unofficial source. The Group wishes to acknowledge the valuable help of the research staff working on this project, Mr. Leonard Tivey and his assistant, Miss M. Rendel, who have been responsible for the drafting of the report.

## INTRODUCTION

THE responsibilities of government have broadened enormously in this century. In Britain, as in other countries, many new functions have been taken up, necessitating a governmental apparatus of much greater size and complexity. These changes mean that administration is no longer a self-contained system: there has developed a continuing need for contact and consultation with people outside the civil service. This use of independent advisers constitutes a striking change in the general atmosphere of administration, but it is difficult to study many of its aspects, for it is often an *ad hoc* and sometimes a personal and confidential process. But there are some formal arrangements, in the shape of advisory committees, and these are the subject of this enquiry. They are particularly significant for the modern system of government because they illustrate both the development of contacts with organised interest groups and the provision of specialist and technical advice in many fields.

This report is concerned with those advisory committees attached to departments of the central government in Britain which are of a standing or permanent rather than a temporary character. It does not deal with Royal Commissions, committees of enquiry, or other temporary bodies. Local and regional committees are also excluded.

The bodies within the scope of the report are variously called committees, councils, boards, panels and so on. They are here described generically as "committees" since they all have a task (the provision of advice) committed to them by another body—Parliament or a Government department.

In Chapter Two the general field of study is described. There were in 1958 nearly five hundred committees within the definition just set out, and it has obviously been impossible to examine all of them within the time available. The report is based therefore on studies of the more important committees. Much of the information about the various committees was obtained by interviews—with civil servants, with officials of national organisations and with individuals who had experience of advisory committees. This was supplemented by published material where this was available. Previous discussions of the subject are found in *Advisory Bodies* by

R. V. Vernon and N. S. Mansergh (Allen and Unwin, 1940), and in Chapter Three of *Government by Committee* by K. C. Wheare (Oxford, 1955).

The report aims to cover its subject in a broad general way, to bring out the problems relevant to the use of advisory committees and to consider their place in the national political system. It is impossible for a report of this kind to be exhaustive, and detailed studies on particular aspects of the work of, for example, the more specialist and technical committees could be undertaken with profit. But it is hoped that the present study provides a survey that is both comprehensive and illuminating.



## PART I

### General

#### CHAPTER I

#### THE DEVELOPMENT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

ALL governments need advice, but the means by which they seek it and the persons and groups that they consult are various. At first the seeking of advice may be occasional, but skilful counsellors may make themselves so necessary that occasional consultation becomes habitual. Often formal machinery is created to facilitate consultation. Once the habit of consultation has become established, it is difficult to break: the habit gradually becomes a convention.

In Britain the Head of State is the Queen, and, formally, Ministers are her agents and advisers. But in practice now real decisions are taken by Ministers, either in Cabinet or individually, and "advice" to the Crown has become a constitutional procedure. Ministers, however, do not act alone; they have civil servants to carry out their decisions and some of the more senior civil servants are the advisers and counsellors of Ministers as well as their agents. Thus there are two widely-recognised stages in the advisory process: formal advice to the Queen, and the constant counselling of Ministers by civil servants. This century has seen the growth of a third stage: advice to Ministers and civil servants by individuals and independent organisations outside the machinery of government. Standing advisory committees, the subject of this report, are a feature of this third stage.

#### EARLY COMMITTEES

The history of advisory bodies in the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, or even the nineteenth centuries has not yet been written, and this chapter does not attempt to repair the omission. The historian's task will not be made easier by the complexity of the story. Governments, like individuals, ask for advice for many reasons besides the want of wise counsel. On occasions they do it

in order to flatter, to find support, to seek out opposition, to learn facts and to shift responsibility. This mixture of motives leads to a variety of arrangements, in the past as well as the present: and administrative bodies are constantly found giving advice and advisory bodies becoming more and more administrative. The basic difficulty, however, is that it is never easy to distinguish what would now be called Cabinet from departmental committees or either from advisory committees, because the distinctions between Ministers, civil servants and others were not as clear in the past as they are now.

In the first place, not all Privy Councillors had departmental responsibilities; thus until the Cabinet was clearly differentiated from the Privy Council, both the Privy Council itself and committees composed of its members included some who would now be regarded as Ministers and some who would now be regarded as outsiders. In the second place, Ministers, until in some cases the last quarter of the nineteenth century, carried out functions which would now be carried out by their administrative or even executive civil servants. Pitt was considered unusual in that he used to take a Treasury clerk into his confidence,<sup>1</sup> and of Lord Salisbury and his civil servants it was said that "the asking or receiving of advice, the taking of counsel together did not form recognisable elements in their relations".<sup>2</sup>

Nevertheless, it is clear that the practice of establishing official bodies with advisory functions is an old one. For example, the origins of the Board of Trade can be traced to a very early advisory committee. On 27 October 1621, a number of merchants met members of the Privy Council to discuss "the decay of Trade and the want of Money".<sup>3</sup> Its immediate successor, established in 1622, became a standing committee producing reports, and in 1639 at least seems to have included some thirty of the most experienced merchants of London.<sup>4</sup> From 1650 to 1672 there was a series of standing committees including merchants and others among their

<sup>1</sup> K. B. Smellie, *A Hundred Years of English Government* (Duckworth), 1950, p. 176.

<sup>2</sup> Lady G. Cecil, *Life of Salisbury* (Hodder and Stoughton), 1921-32, Vol. III, p. 205.

<sup>3</sup> Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Report on the Archives of the City of Exeter*, Cmd. 7640 of 1916, p. 108, quoted by Sir Hubert Llewellyn Smith, *The Board of Trade* (Putnam), 1928, p. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Duke of Portland's Papers*, Vol. I, p. 405, quoted by Sir Hubert Llewellyn Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

members. All except the last two were large bodies—the committee set up in 1655 had more than seventy members—with tiny secretarial staffs and varying degrees of ineffectiveness. There was a continuity of membership as, for example, four of the members of the committee under Cromwell were members of the committee after the Restoration.

After 1672, a further series of committees was appointed. These committees were small. Their members were paid and merchants were no longer appointed. They were responsible also for plantations. The committees, which after 1696 were known as the Board of Trade, had a chequered existence, but developed into a department with executive functions. This development was impeded, however, by the jealousy of other Departments of State and by the weakness of some members and Presidents of the Board. The Board of Trade was, indeed, almost extinct when it was reorganised by Pitt and since then it has continued to grow in responsibility, power and prestige.

#### MODERN ADVISORY COMMITTEES

With the approach of the twentieth century the rise of the advisory committee or council as it is known to-day begins. One of the earliest of modern advisory committees was the Trustee Savings Banks Inspection Committee set up in 1891. The work of this Committee is twofold: as its title implies it is supervisory, but it also advises the National Debt Commissioners on questions arising from the proposed amalgamations and special investments of trustee savings banks.<sup>5</sup>

The Colonial Office set up several advisory committees before the first world war. These included the Advisory Committee for the Tropical Diseases Research Fund set up in 1905, and the Advisory Medical and Sanitary Committee for Tropical Africa and the Entomological Research Committee, both set up in 1909. These were all committees of experts who would advise, formally the Secretary of State, in practice Colonial Office officials, on their special subjects. It is worth noting two other features of these committees: they were concerned with scientific subjects, and they were concerned with the development and use of scientific knowledge to improve the conditions of living in the territories

<sup>5</sup> R. V. Vernon and N. S. Mansergh, *Advisory Bodies* (Allen and Unwin), 1940, p. 92.

with which they dealt. They have been succeeded by others with similar or extended responsibilities. The committees were appointed because the Colonial Office at that time lacked within itself expert scientists and social scientists.

It was not only the Colonial Office which was confronted with technical problems. The Home Office, the Board of Education and the Board of Trade were among the departments which set up committees. In 1913, the Home Office set up a Committee under the Cruelty to Animals Act of 1876 following the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Vivisection, "to advise the Secretary of State whether or not to allow certificates for experiments on living animals which are novel, of exceptional severity or involve extensive cutting operations". The Board of Education in 1913 set up two advisory committees, one for the Science Museum and one for the Victoria and Albert Museum, to advise on the needs of the museums and on purchases.

The committees at the Board of Trade were perhaps a little different. Section 9 of the Census of Production Act of 1906 required the Board to appoint committees, which were to include members who were active in various trades and industries and familiar with conditions, to advise on the drafting of forms and the methods of conducting the census. Another statutory committee set up in 1906 was the Merchant Shipping Advisory Committee, composed of representatives of all shipping interests—shipowners, underwriters, naval architects, classification societies, deck officers, engineers, seamen, pilots and radio operators—to advise on rules and regulations under the Merchant Shipping Acts. The Committee has discussed such questions as the safety of life at sea, the accommodation of crew and passengers, and the relations between crew and master. The groups represented on the Committee could certainly offer expert advice, but they were also the groups to be most affected by the rules and regulations to be made after they had been consulted. It was a sort of shipping parliament, where those subject to the laws were consulted on the laws to be passed.

Another body with advisory functions which was active at the beginning of this century was the Council of the Secretary of State for India, originally set up in 1858. Its duty was "to conduct the business transacted in the United Kingdom in relation to the Government of India and the Correspondence with India". All

correspondence, other than secret or urgent orders, had to be laid before the Council and the concurrence of a majority of the Council was required for certain acts such as, for example, the borrowing of money in Great Britain on the security of Indian revenues, expenditure, the raising of loans, the making of regulations for the distribution of patronage among the authorities in India and the appointment to certain scheduled posts of persons not belonging to the Indian Civil Service. It was the Secretary of State only who had the initiative in referring matters to the Council, but nevertheless its powers were not confined to refusing to concur. The Secretary of State did consult it on major issues of policy, such as the transfer of the capital from Calcutta to Delhi, and the announcement of August 1917 on the advance towards responsible government.<sup>6</sup>

"I want this to be a real Council, a real advisory body: I do not want it to be in any sense merely a debating body", said Lord Lee of Fareham at the first meeting of the Council of Agriculture for England in 1920 and on several occasions he declared his hope that the Council would function as an "Agricultural Parliament". The Council was composed of members of the County and County Borough Agricultural Committees nominated by those Committees; of members of the Agricultural Wages Board nominated by the Board; and of persons nominated by the Board of Agriculture to represent agricultural workers, owners and tenants of agricultural land, horticulture and agricultural education and research. There were to be at least three women members of the Committee.<sup>7</sup> Its function was to discuss in public "matters of public interest relating to agriculture and other rural interests".<sup>8</sup> Associated with the Council was the Agricultural Advisory Committee. This was composed of members of the Council from each of the groups represented on it. It was to advise the Board of Agriculture on agricultural matters concerning the Board's powers and duties submitted to it and to make recommendations on other matters affecting agricultural and rural interests. Neither the Council nor the Committee came up to Lord Lee's expectations, which were indeed unrealistic. As long as the Minister of Agriculture is responsible for his department's work to the Cabinet and to

<sup>6</sup> Sir Malcolm Seton, *The India Office* (Putnam), 1926, p. 35.

<sup>7</sup> R. V. Vernon and N. S. Mansergh, *op. cit.*, pp. 393-9.

<sup>8</sup> Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries Act, 1919, part II, section 3.

Parliament, he cannot be responsible to an "agricultural parliament" outside Westminster. Such a body, whether with 150 members as the Council had, or some sixteen as the Committee numbered, must be in the nature of a debating body. It may be extremely valuable as such: it can make clear to the Ministry the views of all those represented on it and it can provide the Ministry, to some extent, with expert knowledge that it would otherwise lack. In this way it could help to meet Lord Lee's desire that Government departments "should be kept in the closest possible touch with instructed public feeling and opinion with regard to the matters with which the departments have to deal".

### *The Haldane Report*

It is this sort of function that the Haldane Committee on the Machinery of Government foresaw for advisory committees. The Committee thought there should be an important place for such bodies:

But the preservation of the full responsibility of Ministers for executive action will not, in our opinion, ensure that the course of administration which they adopt will secure and retain public confidence unless it is recognised as an obligation upon departments to avail themselves of the advice and assistance of advisory bodies so constituted as to make available the knowledge and experience of all sections of the community affected by the activities of the Department.\*

The Committee made no recommendations on the form of organisation for advisory bodies; their constitutions and methods of consultation would vary with the objects pursued. Several committees were commended as examples of what the Committee had in mind.

The Consultative Committee of the Board of Education was one of these. It was set up in 1900 by Order-in-Council under Section 4 of the Education Act of 1899. It had three functions: the first two were to advise the Board on the inspection of secondary schools, and to frame regulations for a register of teachers; but these were nugatory. The third function was "to advise the Board on any matters referred to the Committee by the Board", and this the Committee carried out. The Board appointed eminent and capable people who were able to represent most educational

\* *Report of the Machinery of Government Committee*, Cmd. 9230, 1918, p. 11.

interests. While educational interests were anxious that the Committee should play as large a part as possible in the Board's work, bringing the assistance of experts to the Board, and some share in educational administration to the teachers, the Board for its part was determined not to be committed by any conclusions the Committee might reach. It therefore set itself to find subjects for the Committee to investigate, which, while of educational importance, were not urgent questions of policy. It was this Committee that produced the famous Hadow Report of 1926 on the education of the adolescent and the Spens Report on secondary education in 1938. The history of the Consultative Committee has, as is shown later, been repeated to a large extent by that of the post-1944 Central Council for Education (England).

A fund to finance medical research was provided for under the National Insurance Act of 1911, and an advisory organisation was set up to administer it. Schemes for research were to be framed by a Medical Research Committee composed of nine experts appointed in a personal capacity. These schemes were to be submitted to the Chairman of the Joint Committee, in practice the Minister responsible for the insurance scheme. He had to consult an Advisory Council for Research composed of some forty-two members, of whom thirty-three were representatives appointed by the Royal Society, the universities, the Royal Colleges, the King Edward VII Hospital Fund and the Government departments concerned. Nevertheless, it was the Minister who could approve the scheme and he was not bound by the opinions expressed by the Council. According to the Annual Reports of the Medical Research Committee this Council was consulted once—there is no other mention of its activities. In 1919 the Medical Research Committee was transferred to the Privy Council and became, in effect, a department in its own right. The Advisory Council was not resurrected.

### *The 1930's*

The Import Duties Advisory Committee was set up in March 1932. It was to recommend the imposition of *ad valorem* duties for the purpose of protecting United Kingdom manufactures in the national interest. The Treasury could not impose duties other than those recommended by the Committee, or impose them at a higher rate. The Committee was powerful, not only for the

powers it possessed but also for the way in which it used them. It imposed re-organisation and some measure of rationalisation on the steel industry by refusing to recommend a tariff unless such re-organisation took place. In 1939, the Committee was wound up and its functions transferred to the Board of Trade, but in the intervening period it had dealt with nearly 340 applications for additions to the free list and about 420 applications for tariff increases.<sup>10</sup> To deal with so much work the Committee had to have a staff and in 1935 it employed 130 people. In these circumstances it may be wondered why this work was ever given to a committee rather than being done by an existing department. The intention was "to remove the determination of the details of tariff policy away from political influence by the device of referring the whole subject to an independent authority not responsible to a Minister and Parliament".<sup>11</sup> It may be significant that the Import Duties Act of 1958 did not revive the idea of an independent committee. A modern committee rather similar in intention is the Capital Issues Committee, though the Treasury retains formal responsibility for final decisions in these matters.

Other committees were concerned with other aspects of Government intervention in economic affairs. The slump in shipping and in cotton in the 1930's led the Government to make special arrangements to assist these industries to adjust themselves to new conditions. Much of the administration of these arrangements was left to the industries themselves by means of committees composed of representative members, which had to submit to Parliament or the Minister reports on their work. Among these committees were the Advisory Committee to the Spindles Board, the Cotton Industry Advisory Committee, the Ships Replacement Committee, and the Tramp Shipping Administrative Committee.<sup>12</sup> These bodies illustrate a tendency that recurs in the history of advisory committees: the tendency to give administrative duties to bodies set up in an advisory capacity. But though the growth of Government functions means that some bodies become more than advisory, this does not diminish the need for advisory committees—in fact, new committees spring up to give advice to the new administrative organisation.

<sup>10</sup> PEP, *Industrial Trade Associations*, 1957, p. 26.

<sup>11</sup> R. V. Vernon and N. S. Mansergh, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

<sup>12</sup> R. V. Vernon and N. S. Mansergh, *op. cit.*, pp. 149 and 157-8.



Two further economic committees should be mentioned. The Board of Trade Advisory Council functioned for a time between the wars. It included representatives of the principal industries, of commerce, finance and labour, of other Government departments, and of the Dominions and India. Its monthly meetings were presided over by the President of the Board of Trade and consisted of general discussions of the current situation in industry, commerce, finance and so on. The Council was therefore a forerunner of the various consultative councils for industrial affairs which exist to-day in that its aim was not the production of agreed recommendations but the provision of a forum for the expression of various points of view.

The Economic Advisory Council, appointed in January 1930 by the Labour Government, did not have a successful career. It had very wide terms of reference to advise on economic matters and included leading industrialists, trade unionists and economists among its nineteen independent members. But it was not able to make its voice effective: its reports were confidential and they were concerned with national economic policies, on which the Government and the Treasury had their own views.

#### THE GROWTH OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Writing in 1940, R. V. Vernon pointed out that whenever Government invaded new territory the civil service found itself without its usual stock of accumulated wisdom and it had to look outside for knowledge. During the first world war, for example, it was the Ministries of Munitions, Shipping, Blockade and Food that made extensive use of consultative and advisory committees. Vernon remarks, however, that "the post-war years were marked by a disposition to resort to 'outside advice' much more readily and habitually than had been the pre-war custom", and this tendency was reinforced by the recommendation of the Haldane Committee in favour of advisory bodies.<sup>13</sup>

No estimate of the number of advisory committees before 1939 is available. Over 600 bodies in some sense advisory are listed in Vernon and Mansergh's book as having existed between 1919 and 1939, but it seems clear that the majority of these were *ad hoc* or temporary bodies, and not standing advisory committees within

<sup>13</sup> R. V. Vernon and N. S. Mansergh, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-21.

the scope of this report. The number of advisory committees in this sense in existence in 1939 was probably round about 200.

In 1949 the Prime Minister, Mr. Attlee, gave a figure of 700 for the number of "central or national" advisory bodies, and said that the compilation of a list for the localities would be too arduous an undertaking.<sup>14</sup> But an examination of the list made at this time shows that many sub-committees and temporary committees were included, and that the count extended beyond the main departments to such organisations as the National Savings Committee and the Research Councils. A more conservative figure of 470 emerges if these are discounted.

In 1958 the figure of 850 national advisory bodies was given in reply to a Parliamentary Question. This again seems to include some bodies which are really only sub-committees, and some which are temporary, in addition to those attached to organisations outside the main core of Whitehall departments. In Chapter Two it is suggested that 484 is a more accurate figure for advisory committees within the scope of this report—bodies attached to departments of the central government in an advisory capacity, containing non-official members, and of a standing rather than a temporary character.

The general cause of the growth of advisory committees is the extension of Government functions and Government responsibilities. It is mainly (though not entirely) in connection with these new functions that advisory committees flourish. The interest of many departments in technical matters means that they must keep up with scientific advances wherever they take place, and this means systematic contact with the scientific world. Again the general responsibility for economic prosperity which the Government has undertaken brings with it the need for mutual understanding between industry, the trade unions and the Government, and consultative committees are means to this end. The social services undergo constant development and improvement, and advisory committees help to keep departments in touch with the experience of field workers and independent organisations. There are grounds for believing, therefore, that the need for advisory committees will be permanent. Generally, departments will not learn how to manage their new tasks themselves. They will always need a flow of advice and information, for the topics with which

<sup>14</sup> *Hansard*, Col. 15-16, 18 January 1949.

they deal—scientific knowledge, industry, social needs—are constantly changing.

By 1958, then, advisory committees of various types had achieved an established position in the British governmental system. But the effect of their advice was, it seems, open to dispute:

Mr. Lipton asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer how many advisory bodies now advise Her Majesty's Government at the national level.

Mr. Simon: There are about 850 advisory bodies of a central or national character.

Mr. Lipton: With that wealth of advice available to the Government, how is it that they get into such a frightful mess? In dealing with all the problems with which they are called upon to deal, do the Government take the advice of these 850 bodies which advise them on a variety of topics?

Mr. Simon: It is partly, but not exclusively, due to the advice of these bodies that the Government record has been such a triumphant one.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>15</sup> *Hansard*, Col. 1305, 20 November 1958. The figure of 850, as explained above, is a maximum one and includes many outside the scope of this report.

## CHAPTER 2

### GENERAL REVIEW

**A**DVISORY committees do not constitute a system, in the sense in which the courts or local authorities may be said to constitute a system. They are not interdependent and they have few direct links with one another. There is no general planned scheme of outside advice of which they form a part. They are attachments to administration by departments, and in the main their work can only be understood in relation to the powers and functions of Ministers.

The primary purpose of advisory committees is to advise the Ministers who set them up, by one method or another and most committees do so in a practical as well as a nominal sense. But there are a few which have such a degree of authority that their proposals are only nominally "advice". The Minister retains a right of veto, and the committee may even act in his name, but only in the most abnormal circumstance would he challenge its decisions or decline to accept its proposals. The University Grants Committee is a well-known example of a body in this position, and some other instances are mentioned below in the paragraphs on "administrative committees".

The consequence of these exceptional cases is that the word "advisory" used under these circumstances sometimes describes status rather than function. An advisory committee is a body to which a Minister has given certain tasks, but which does not have final executive responsibility. However, the great majority of such bodies have advisory functions as well as advisory status, and these are the main concern of this report.

Though the function of advisory committees is always in some sense to give advice, it should not be supposed therefore that this is the whole of the story. Clearly Ministers and civil servants allow other motives besides the need for advice to influence the decision to establish a committee, and consequently to modify the form it takes, its composition, and the way it works. For instance, there may be pressure from outside a department—from Parliament, from interest groups or from public opinion generally. The

Central Advisory Council for Education (England) was established owing to a widespread feeling in 1944 that the Minister ought to have disinterested advice on high policy. The Engineering Advisory Council was in part a response to trade union pressure for Government action in the industry. The Council for Wales and Monmouthshire is an attempt to meet a Welsh desire for autonomy.

From time to time an advisory committee, either expert or consultative, is found useful as a means of launching a new Government policy on the public. With more or less prompting a committee may come to accept the urgency or necessity of a particular line, and so become the agent whereby a wider circle is persuaded. This manoeuvre may be valuable where a department believes it sees the general issues more clearly than groups concentrating on particular aspects of a subject. The Central Housing Advisory Committee and the National Joint Advisory Council at the Ministry of Labour are committees where these tactics seem to have been attempted, not always successfully of course.

Advisory committees may also enable a Minister to avoid taking decisions himself on certain matters, or to be shielded to some extent from criticism when he does take them. The Capital Issues Committee is known to have the *de facto* responsibility for decisions about new issues of shares, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer thus avoids discussing this topic. The reports of the National Insurance Advisory Committee may be used by the Ministry to justify the law as applied in a particular case—on the encashment of draft payments for example.<sup>1</sup> A Minister may sometimes find it easier to attribute his decisions to the advice of committees rather than to that of civil servants, even expert professional ones: the authority of a committee may be more independent and may seem stronger.

When Royal Commissions and departmental committees of enquiry are set up the Government is sometimes accused of delaying tactics, of avoiding action on a delicate issue. This report is not concerned with these temporary bodies. But cynics may find in the referring of certain questions to standing advisory committees a similar diversion. The establishment of a high-sounding committee may be calculated to impress public opinion, though the Government in fact rarely takes its advice—for example, the

<sup>1</sup> See *Hansard*, Col. 1726-7, 24 July 1959

Economic Advisory Council in the 1930's found itself in this position.

All these motives may play a part in the establishment of one committee or another. But it would be uncharitable to suppose that they are necessarily the dominating ones. In any case what a Minister and his department will get from advisory committees is advice and recommendations, counsel and suggestions, whether that was what they were really looking for or not. This report will describe, therefore, how committees are composed and operate before, in Chapter Five, considering the sort of influence they have in governmental affairs.

### THREE MAIN TYPES

The advisory committees which fall within the scope of this report are listed in Special Study V at the end of the book. Three main types may be distinguished among them:

- (a) Consultative committees—bodies where representatives of the Government meet people from outside the Government machine (usually the nominees of interest groups) for general discussion.
- (b) Expert committees—bodies which formulate recommendations for action in a particular field. Perhaps sixty or seventy per cent fall into this category.
- (c) Committees for independent administration—bodies with advisory status which in practice decide matters themselves. They include some committees which have almost a quasi-judicial character and some negotiating committees.

These categories are explained at greater length below. But it must be emphasised that they cannot be applied with any rigidity. Some committees are obviously expert and others are obviously consultative, but there are a great many which are difficult to put into these categories because they combine both functions. Indeed, no matter how technical or how scholarly an expert committee, it is almost certain to provide some channel of contact with parts of the community, like a consultative committee, since its members unconsciously represent the outlook of their discipline or profession. This consultative element in expert committees is even stronger, of course, when they are composed largely of nominees of various organisations, as frequently is the case.

*Vice versa*, a consultative committee, primarily designed for the discussion of the views of independent organisations, will rarely be lacking in members with some special knowledge or technique of interest to the Government. This is particularly the case with trade associations and professional organisations, but the understanding of its own members' attitudes is itself a vital skill, the benefits of which any interest group can pass on to (or withhold from) the Government. Some committees for independent administration are also used from time to time for consultative purposes or to provide expert advice, so this is not an exclusive category either. The distinction between various types of advisory committee is therefore a matter of degree. It is possible to say of most advisory committees that they are *primarily* consultative or expert or administrative; but few belong entirely to any one category.

The following brief review may clarify the situation with regard to this rough classification. The descriptions refer to stereotypes: scarcely any committee follows all the rules.

### *Consultative committees*

On a typical consultative committee the representatives of the Government are present in force. They are usually civil servants; but on some committees Parliamentary Secretaries and senior Ministers take part. The officials usually include representatives of various departments in addition to the one sponsoring the committee. There are also the representatives or nominees of outside organisations, perhaps two or three times as many as on the Government side. In some cases there may be only one such organisation. But mostly there are several—various trade associations, both employers' organisations and trade unions, and so on.

The advice tendered on these committees is essentially oral. It is what is said then and there at committee meetings that is important: no written reports are prepared, and the minutes or any press releases are secondary matters. There is, of course, a two-way traffic—the Government presents its views and supplies information to the organisations, and *vice versa*.

The main field for consultative committees is industrial. The National Production Advisory Council on Industry (over which the Chancellor of the Exchequer presides) is a leading example of this type: the Economic Planning Board and the Engineering Advisory Council are others. They are found therefore at those

departments which are responsible for dealing with the problems of industry. Most "consumers' committees" have a method of operation which puts them into this category.

### *Expert committees*

There is a great variety of expert committees, for the class is not confined to bodies of a highly specialised or technical character. The members of these committees sit as individuals, though in many cases their names have been suggested to the appointing Minister by national organisations. Though they do not necessarily present the views of such organisations, even though they may be connected with them, they reflect varying interests, attitudes and experience. On many (but by no means all) expert committees the Government is not represented except by the secretariat, and though the wishes of the department are no doubt made known, the committee in the main proceeds autonomously.

The object of such committees is to make recommendations by the production of written reports. The discussions, working papers, evidence, minutes and so on are stages towards this objective, but with these committees it is what is in the reports that is important. Though Government departments may supply information or give evidence, or have representatives present at meetings, the "advice" is inherently from the committee to the Government.

These committees are found over the whole range of Government activities. Notable ones where names are suggested by organisations include the Central Health Services Council and the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers. On the Scientific Advisory Council at the Ministry of Supply, or the Committee on Social Development in the Colonies, there is no nomination by recognised organisations.

### *Administrative committees*

The object of having committees with advisory status but great independent authority is to detach administrative work from the main Government machine. There has been in this century a tendency to take various administrative tasks out of the ordinary civil service routine, and set up public corporations and other semi-independent bodies. The committee with advisory status is a way of doing this sort of thing in a modified way. Financial con-



trol and, indeed, ultimate control of all decisions, remains with the Minister: but in practice the committee—of part-time, outside people—is settling administrative questions. The University Grants Committee is perhaps the best-known example. It controls in effect the distribution of the Government's quinquennial grant to universities. The need here is to preserve academic freedom—to ensure that whatever control the Government has is general and indirect.

It is difficult to determine, of course, whether a body has a sufficient degree of authority to make it fit appropriately into this category. Certainly no one can say of any committee that a Minister will never reject its advice, but the following committees seem at any rate to have a very high degree of independent authority: the Colonial University Grants Committee, the East African and the West African Currency Boards and the former Colonial Research Council (Colonial Office); the Central Training Council in Child Care and the State Management Districts Council (Home Office); the Air Transport Advisory Council and the Air Safety Board (Ministry of Aviation) and the Development Commission, the Capital Issues Committee and the Development Areas Treasury Advisory Committee<sup>2</sup> (H.M. Treasury).

There are a small number of committees with advisory status where the work sometimes seems to approach that of a quasi-judicial body. The clearest example is the Panel of Advisers at the Treasury who hear appeals in security cases; but there are others making judgements in individual cases—the Political Honours Scrutiny Committee (Treasury), the Advisory Committee for the admission of Jewish Ecclesiastical Officers to the United Kingdom (Home Office), the Advisory Panel to consider Deferment Applications by Post-graduate Students (Ministry of Labour) and the Authorisation of Merchants Advisory Panel (Agriculture). Though these and a few other committees deal with individual cases of one sort or other it would be a mistake to suppose that this aspect of affairs is important so far as the general picture of advisory committees is concerned. Only a very small number can be called quasi-judicial in any sense at all and these are still advisory committees, not tribunals. It may be urged that some matters—the security appeals, the deprivation of citizenship—

<sup>2</sup> Under Section 4 of the Distribution of Industry Act, 1945, the Treasury can advance money to certain applicants *only* if the DATAC so recommends.

ought to be handled by genuine tribunals, but this does not affect the present character of the committees. Normally, the recommendations of these committees must be decisive, or they would lose their *raison d'être*. It is appropriate therefore to classify them with administrative committees.

A few committees for the negotiation of wages, salaries and conditions have advisory status. They consist essentially of two sides, the representatives of the employers and of the employees; and the outcome of their bargaining takes the form of advice to a Minister that certain rates shall be paid, etc. The Burnham Committees on the salaries of teachers are well-known examples of this type of committee and the Police Council for Great Britain (not the statutory Police Council) is a similar negotiating committee. Whitley Councils, of course, take the same form, but the outside element here consists only of those officials of unions or staff associations who are not civil servants, and since the Councils are occupied with civil service problems they are usually regarded as internal bodies. Joint negotiating committees in the local government field are for the most part no concern of the central government, and of course negotiating bodies in industry are not in any sense advisory to the Government. Like the other types of committee in this category, the negotiating body which is an advisory committee illustrates the overlapping of different types of body rather than any distinctive characteristics of advisory committees proper.

#### PROBLEMS OF DEFINITION

The above classification is based on function—on the sort of work the committee does and the way it operates. It is not to be confused with one based on composition, on whether the committee consists of the representatives of outside organisations, of their nominees, or of individuals not associated with any group. Consultative committees often contain a large number of representatives or nominees, of course; but expert committees, engaged in producing a specialised report, may be similarly constituted. These and other questions of committee composition are discussed in Chapter Three.

It will be noticed that other possible categories have been masked by the above grouping. There is no category of research committees, and certainly many committees are concerned with

aspects of scientific research. But where these are giving specialised advice about research carried on by the Government, they are clearly expert committees, and where (like the Colonial Research Council) they sponsor or organise research they are performing an administrative function. It therefore seems proper to regard research as a form of subject-matter with which various types of committee deal, rather than something which calls for a distinct type of committee.

Government research is, therefore, not a main theme of this report. The work of the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research and its research stations, the work of the research bodies under the Minister for Science (the Medical Research Council, the Agricultural Research Council, and the Nature Conservancy), or the activities under the former Ministry of Supply are regarded as substantive Government activities—about which, indeed, the bodies concerned receive advice from outside.

Another sub-class of advisory body is the consumer committee. In various fields a practice has grown up of making arrangements for the regular presentation of the views of consumers through a committee. Many of these are concerned with nationalised industries or services; but they fall within the scope of this report because they have direct access to the Minister concerned. Leading committees of this type are the Industrial Coal Consumers' Council and the Domestic Coal Consumers' Council, at the Ministry of Power, and the Central Transport Consultative Committee, advising the Minister of Transport. These all contain representatives of the public corporations concerned, and thus operate like a consultative committee, by face-to-face discussion with the responsible authorities—but they report to the Minister, an unnecessary procedure for most consultative committees, where the department is directly represented. There are also numerous regional and local consumer and user committees in gas, electricity, and transport. Beyond the nationalised industries, there are consumers' committees in agriculture (set up under the Agricultural Marketing Acts) and an Oil Consumers' Council at the Ministry of Power.

The proper influence of the consumer in industry is a special problem, and there is no full treatment in this report of the issues involved. Consumer committees are only referred to in so far as they exhibit the usual characteristics of advisory committees, and

they are treated mainly as a sub-class of consultative committees, rather than a separate type.

A committee in a distinctive position is the Council on Prices, Productivity and Incomes. This was set up in 1957 to report on the economic position in relation to these three matters. It proceeded independently of the Government, and its reports were addressed, not merely to Ministers or departments, but to all concerned with the economic situation—trade unions, employers and the nation at large. It is therefore a committee for "public education" like some consultative committees—but it is clearly a committee of experts, and the views it presents are its own and not necessarily those of the Government.

It is not always easy to determine whether a particular body is attached to the Government or not. Sometimes organisations are set up at the instigation of a department and receive a subsidy, but have no further official connection with the Government. The British Productivity Council, the successor of the Anglo-American Productivity Council, is such an organisation. The Dollar Exports Council is another. These bodies consist of individuals, drawn from both sides of industry and associated interests. The major part of their work consists in the direct promotion of productivity or exports, but since they work closely with the Government there is an undoubted consultative or advisory aspect to their activities. However, the two facts together—their administrative independence of the Government, and the secondary nature of their advisory work—take them out of the centre of the picture so far as this report is concerned. A committee in some ways analogous to the Dollar Exports Council, the Advisory Council on Middle East Trade, is a genuine Government committee, set up by and serviced by the Board of Trade. The composition and functions of the Petroleum Industry Advisory Council are similar to those of other industrial consultative committees, but the Council was set up by the industry not the Government.

There are, further, a number of bodies with considerable non-advisory functions. These include the Monopolies Commission, the Council of Industrial Design, the National Savings Committee, the Historic Buildings Councils, and the Ancient Monuments Boards. They have various functions—investigation, publicity, administration and the making of records—to which they devote most of their attention, and considerable staffs to carry them out.

They are advisory in status, however, and they all make recommendations or offer advice to Ministers from time to time.

These various marginal cases cannot be ignored in any consideration of the sources of influence and advice which contribute to shaping of Government policies. But they do not provide the main theme of this report: they are not *primarily* concerned with bringing into the Government machine specialist knowledge developed outside the system, nor are they channels for contact with independent groups. Mostly, they are concerned with research or executive tasks, carried on just outside or just inside the main central governmental system. The advisory committee which is a bridge or a link between the Government and the rest of the community is normally consultative or expert.

The delimitation of any field of enquiry inevitably involves a number of disclaimers, and recent pages have largely been concerned with what the report does *not* discuss. After the following paragraphs on statutory committees, therefore, the report will describe, in a more positive way, the committees with which it is concerned.

#### STATUTORY COMMITTEES

Many of the advisory committees considered in this report owe their existence to statutory enactment. In particular, it has become common for Acts developing new social services or other Government functions to contain provision for a standing advisory committee. By 1958 the number of advisory committees with a statutory basis had reached over a hundred. There are also some committees founded on Ministerial regulations; and others can trace their origin to specific recommendations by Royal Commissions, or departmental committees of enquiry.

The clauses of the statutes setting up the committees vary considerably in the amount of detail they specify. Some merely state that there may be advisory committees:

... For the purpose of advising and assisting him in the performance of his functions under this Act, the Minister may appoint such advisory committees as he thinks fit, and any such committee may be appointed either in respect of the whole of Great Britain or in respect of any area therein.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Employment and Training Act, 1948, Section 1 (2). The Ministry of Labour's Women's Consultative Committee, and its National Advisory Committee on the Employment of Older Men and Women (now wound up) derive from this clause.

In other cases the structure of the committee is set out with some care—for the National Insurance Advisory Committee or the Central Health Services Council, for example. Periodic meetings are rarely prescribed, but the duties of some committees (e.g. the Advisory Committee on the Legal Aid and Advice Act) make annual meetings, at least, virtually compulsory. Annual reports (to be laid before Parliament) are occasionally mentioned. The terms of reference are usually indicated, of course, but often the generality of the committee's functions makes necessary the use of phrases like "advising the Minister as to the performance of his functions under the foregoing provisions of this Act". Statutory committees usually have expert or administrative functions. Statutory provision for committees which are in practice consultative is rare.

The point of statutory enactment is that it gives a committee permanence and independence. The committee cannot be abolished by a Minister who believes it unnecessary or obnoxious, and the Minister may find it difficult to neglect its advice. Nevertheless, a committee may be inactive: the Central Advisory Water Committee<sup>4</sup> was in suspense between 1952 and 1955 during a national economy drive. The Central Advisory Council for Education (England) studies one major problem in its field at a time, and there have been gaps between the completion of one project and the beginning of another. The history of this committee suggests that statutory provision may on occasion be too rigid an approach. Given that schools are run by local authorities, not the Minister of Education, and that several other important advisory councils exist, it is liable to find itself searching for suitable problems to tackle, in order that its interludes of inactivity may not be unduly prolonged.

#### COMMITTEES BY DEPARTMENTS

The use of advisory committees now extends to most parts of the administrative system, though a few departments still do not sponsor any. These include the Foreign Office, the Ministry of Defence, the Inland Revenue, Customs and Excise, and Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

The number of separate and distinct committees at the major departments at the beginning of 1958 is given in the following table.

<sup>4</sup> Established under the Water Act, 1945, Section 2.

## ADVISORY COMMITTEES OF MAJOR DEPARTMENTS IN 1958

Admiralty	13
Agriculture, Fisheries and Food	54
Air	12
Colonial Office	29
Commonwealth Relations	5
Education	16
Health	23
Home Office	30
Housing and Local Government	11
Central Office of Information	4
Labour and National Service	39
Lord Chancellor	1
Lord President	6
Pensions and National Insurance	4
Post Office	5
Power	18
Supply	41
Board of Trade	38
Transport and Civil Aviation	20
Treasury	20
War Office	13
Works	19
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>421</b>
Department of Agriculture for Scotland	15
Scottish Education Department	2
Department of Health for Scotland	23
Scottish Home Department	23
<b>TOTAL, Scotland</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>484</b>

This table, of course, should be used with caution. In some cases the distinction between a separate committee and a sub-committee tends to be arbitrary, and may not be consistent from department to department. Not all committees are active: the table refers to committees in being, which could be called together without re-establishment or reconstitution. Some committees adjudged tem-

porary have had a long life, and some included as standing committees a brief one.

There are also advisory committees connected with research organisations and minor departments which have been excluded from this study. The Agricultural Research Council had six in 1958, the Medical Research Council five and the Nature Conservancy ten; the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research had sixteen major boards and committees, many of which had other committees and sub-committees attached to them. Minor departments with one or two advisory committees included the Land Registry, the Public Record Office, the Royal Mint, the General Register Office and the Export Credits Guarantee Department. The National Savings Committee, however, had ten advisory committees in 1958 and the Forestry Commission five.

#### ECONOMIC AND INDUSTRIAL COMMITTEES

The leading advisory committees in this field are the National Production Advisory Council on Industry (NPACI) and the Economic Planning Board, as well as the Minister of Labour's National Joint Advisory Council (NJAC). Now that there is a measure of central direction of the economy, means of influencing central decisions become very important. These committees provide such a means—they bring leaders of industry into touch with the makers of general economic policy. The NPACI provides a forum where rather larger numbers of employers' and unions' representatives are present and it considers, among other matters, a statement about the economic situation made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The Economic Planning Board is a much smaller committee where a few industrialists and trade unionists discuss national economic policies with senior civil servants.

Other important consultative committees are sponsored by the Board of Trade. The Consultative Committee for Industry deals with general questions of overseas trade. The Engineering Advisory Council surveys problems affecting the whole range of British engineering industry, while the Machine Tool Advisory Council, the National Advisory Council for the Motor Manufacturing Industry, the Instrument Industry Committee and others are concerned with particular branches of it. All these contain representatives of the various industries and usually trade unionists; and senior civil servants attend the meetings.



Committees concerned with overseas trade, besides the CCI, include the Advisory Council on Middle East Trade, the Advisory Council on Overseas Construction and the Advisory Committee on Commercial Information Overseas, and these consist largely of businessmen with experience of the Committee's subject. The Exhibitions Committee is similarly composed and in practice is mainly concerned with the British part in overseas exhibitions. The Cinematograph Films Council differs from the industrial consultative committees: it operates autonomously like an expert committee, and publishes reports stating its recommendations. Most of the other committees at the Board of Trade are less active than these. They include committees concerned with company law, accounting, and insurance; with a number of specialised industries; and with the Censuses of Production and Distribution.<sup>5</sup>

Another important committee concerned with industrial policy is the National Joint Advisory Council. This is presided over by the Minister of Labour and is attended by senior representatives of the Trades Union Congress, the British Employers' Confederation and the nationalised industries. In addition to the Chancellor's quarterly statement about the economic situation, its discussions include matters connected with employment policy, manpower, training and industrial relations. Other leading committees at the Ministry of Labour include the statutory National Advisory Council on the Employment of the Disabled, the Women's Consultative Committee, and the Industrial Health Advisory Committee. There is also a series of joint committees on particular industries, like the Joint Standing Committee for the Drop Forging Industry and the Joint Standing Committee for the Pottery Industry.

The Ministry of Power has mainly expert committees on special issues. Two of the most active are the Scientific Advisory Council, which advises the Minister on scientific problems and developments relating to coal, petroleum and other fuels, and the Fuel Efficiency Advisory Committee which deals with specific problems remitted to it by the Minister. There are also the various consumer councils associated with nationalised industries, though

<sup>5</sup> Many industrial advisory committees are described in a series of articles in the *Board of Trade Journal*, various issues between 13 November 1959 and 22 January 1960.

only the two coal councils are national bodies. There is also an Oil Consumers' Council, meeting annually, which considers matters affecting the sale and supply of petroleum products, such as quality of products, bulk supplies to farmers, and tied garages. The petroleum industry, various transport associations, the TUC and other interested bodies are represented on it.

The Ministry of Transport has a number of committees, dealing with various aspects of land or sea transport. Concerned with road transport are the Committee on Road Safety and the London and Home Counties Traffic Advisory Committee; on railways there is a small statutory committee on Railway Employment (Safety Appliances) which has not met since 1951. So far as shipping is concerned there are a number of committees with specialised interests, such as the Ship's Wireless Working Party. They usually consist of civil servants and experts from interested bodies—shipping organisations, port authorities, the Shipping Federation and so on—and meet infrequently to review developments. A committee on the Carriage of Dangerous Goods and Explosives in Ships meets every four or five weeks. There is a group of committees of importance appointed by the Minister of Transport whose main function is to bring the views of users of facilities provided by the British Transport Commission to the notice of the Commission; though they can, when necessary, make representations to the Minister. These are the Central Transport Consultative Committee, and in the regions the Transport Users' Consultative Committees: they consist in the main of representatives of users, but the Transport Commission is also represented. The Scottish Transport Council studies existing transport facilities in the Highlands and probable future developments in the area.

Civil aviation is dealt with by some general committees which have recently been transferred to the Ministry of Aviation. The National Civil Aviation Consultative Council, set up in 1947, provides a forum for the review of developments generally. The Minister is chairman and there are representatives of a large variety of interested organisations—air lines, aircraft constructors, industrial organisations, air pilots and so on. However, the Council has not met since January 1955. The Air Transport Advisory Council is a small committee with more precise functions: it considers applications for permission to develop new routes and services for

the Air Corporations and private air lines, and also considers representations from the public about the adequacy of services. The Air Safety Board is concerned with air problems affecting the safety of British civil air transport. It consists of four or five experts and meets about five times a year. In addition, there are a few other advisory committees concerned with more specialised aspects of air transport.

Other departments have sponsoring responsibilities for various industries, and a few have established consultative committees in connection with these functions. They include the Shipbuilding Advisory Committee formerly at the Admiralty, but transferred to the Ministry of Transport in 1959, and the National Consultative Council of the Building and Civil Engineering Industries at the Ministry of Works.

### *Agriculture*

The Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food has a very large number of committees, for the most part dealing with specific topics, but covering between them a large part of the Ministry's work. The Agricultural Improvement Council is widest in scope; its business is to advise on the ways in which advances in relevant knowledge are made available to farmers, and to ensure that the technical problems of farming are brought to the attention of research workers. The Advisory Committee on the Provincial Agricultural Economics Service and the Conference of Provincial Agricultural Economists promote a different type of knowledge: the first is concerned with general developments in agricultural economics in the universities, and the Conference approves particular economic investigations and serves as a forum for discussion. The Agricultural Statistics Advisory Committee deals with the collection of statistical returns from farmers; it consists of representatives—from the National Farmers' Union and elsewhere—of those who complete the returns rather than those interested in the resulting statistics. The Consumers' Committee for England and Wales was set up under the Agricultural Marketing Act (1931) to report on the effects of any marketing scheme put forward; the Consumers' Committee for Great Britain does the same with Scottish members added. In addition, there are small Committees of Investigation which take up matters brought out by the reports of the Consumers Committees, or which could

not be considered by them, and consider directions made by the Minister to Marketing Boards.

Also at the Ministry of Agriculture is a series of committees on technical subjects like Bull and Boar Licensing, Artificial Insemination, Pig Recording, Bee Diseases and so on. These consist in varying proportions of representatives of interested bodies and independent experts. The National Food Survey Committee is a small group which considers the use of material collected in food surveys, and means of making them more effective. The Food Standards Committee of about fifteen members meets monthly to consider matters arising under the Food and Drugs Acts, and issues frequent reports. There is a Joint Standing Consultative Committee on Rodent Control, one on the Infestation of Food (with three specialised panels) and a Central Sewer Committee which deals with rats in sewers. The Advisory Committee on the Farm Improvement Scheme and the Smallholdings Advisory Council are active and important consultative bodies, containing representatives of the interested organisations and with the Parliamentary Secretary as chairman. The most important advisory body in the Fisheries side of the department is the White Fish Industry Advisory Council.

#### SOCIAL SERVICE COMMITTEES

Most major social services have a central advisory committee concerned with their general problems, but the character of these committees varies considerably. They include the Central Health Services Council; the Central Advisory Committees for Education; the Central Housing Advisory Council; the Central Advisory Water Committee; the Advisory Council on Child Care and the National Insurance Advisory Committee.

##### *Health*

The Central Health Services Council was established by the National Health Service Act of 1946. It has wide terms of reference, and is representative of all the diverse elements concerned with health services. Potentially, at any rate, it is among the most powerful of advisory committees. Associated with it are some other statutory committees, the Medical Standing Advisory Committee, the Dental Standing Advisory Committee and so on, which are clearly of great importance in their own right. Also at

the Ministry of Health are the National Medical Manpower Committee, the Dental Manpower Committee and the National Consultative Council on the Recruitment of Nurses and Midwives, a group of committees concerned with issues crucial to the interests of the various professions; while the Food Hygiene Advisory Council brings in many outside interests, ancillary to therapeutic medicine.

### *Education*

The Central Advisory Council for Education (England) is not a representative body; its members come from a wide variety of educational fields but they are not chosen after consultation with interested organisations. The Council does not attempt to deal with all current educational issues: it selects a broad topic (or one is remitted to it by the Minister) and conducts a thorough examination of that subject over several years—it has just completed a study of the education of 15–18 year olds. The Central Advisory Council for Education (Wales) is a parallel committee for Wales, but in practice the English council has dealt with subjects of general interest while the Welsh council has only taken up matters of special concern to Wales.

There are two National Advisory Councils of great importance: on Education for Industry and Commerce, and on the Training and Supply of Teachers. The Council on Education for Industry and Commerce has about eighty members, including representatives of industrial organisations as well as those concerned with the provision of education, and it is very much engaged with the expansion of technical education to-day. The Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers includes members from local authorities' and teachers' organisations, and is a leading force in policymaking for all matters concerning the recruitment of teachers.

Also in the educational field are the Burnham Committees, which constitute the salary negotiating machinery for teachers, and the University Grants Committee, attached to the Treasury, which is in practice in the position of an administrative body, though it retains its advisory status. The Ministry of Education has a few other advisory committees including the Secondary Schools Examinations Council and the Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children.

*Housing, local government, and home affairs*

The Central Housing Advisory Committee, set up in 1935, is a committee of fluctuating importance. It has up to thirty members with wide and various experience in housing, has the Minister of Housing in the chair, and from time to time its sub-committees publish reports on particular topics. The Central Advisory Water Committee was suspended between 1952 and 1955; since then it has produced reports on the growing demand for water, on information about water resources and on trade effluents. It consists of experts chosen by the Minister rather than representatives of interested parties. Also at the Ministry of Housing and Local Government are the Clean Air Council and a few more technical committees, on Ironstone Restoration, Synthetic Detergents, etc.

Local authorities are also closely concerned with several committees at the Home Office. Some of these—the Joint Negotiating Committee for the Probation Service, the Central Fire Brigades Advisory Council, and the Police Council for Great Britain—are largely concerned with pay and service conditions and are balanced between representatives of the employing authorities and the employees' associations. Other Home Office committees, like the Poisons Board, the Advisory Committee on the Cruelty to Animals Act of 1876, and the Advisory Committee for the Admission of Jewish Ecclesiastical Officers to the United Kingdom, give the Home Secretary advice on specialised matters where it is desired to demonstrate a degree of independence. The State Management Districts Council, the Fire Service College Board, and the Police College Board of Governors are virtually administrative bodies. There is a group of committees concerned with criminology of which the Advisory Council on the Treatment of Offenders was, in 1958, the most important. There are also a number of committees dealing with civil defence matters which meet occasionally. The Protection of Birds Advisory Committee is statutorily required and meets regularly. The Advisory Council on Child Care and the Central Training Council in Child Care have substantially the same membership, of persons with expert knowledge or experience of various aspects of child care; the first gives general advice on the development of policy and the drafting of regulations, while the Training Council has administrative functions relating to the promotion of courses of training and selects trainees.

*Pensions and national insurance*

Two important committees were set up by the social insurance reforms of 1946. The National Insurance Advisory Committee is a small expert group which considers regulations in draft and other questions referred to it by the Minister. It is a body with high prestige and exerts a very strong influence on the development of services under the Act. The Industrial Injuries Advisory Council is a slightly larger body which exercises similar functions in relation to industrial injuries. Two committees on war pensions date from the first world war.

## DEFENCE COMMITTEES

Each of the service departments has a number of committees, some technical like the Flying Personnel Research Committee at the Air Ministry or the Gas Turbine Committee at the War Office, and some concerned with more general subjects, for instance the Army Education Advisory Board, the Advisory Committee on the Naval Chaplaincy Service or the Air Cadet Council. At the Ministry of Defence there is an important Defence Research Policy Committee, but this consists entirely of civil servants and hence lies outside the scope of this report.

## SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEES

The Advisory Council on Scientific Policy is the most important committee in this category. It was set up in 1947 following the recommendations of the Barlow Committee on future scientific policy. It consists partly of independent scientists and partly of scientists from Government organisations and has wide terms of reference—to advise the Minister for Science on the formulation and execution of Government scientific policy. It has been concerned with the organisation of research, scientific manpower, scientific libraries and so on.

There are several research councils which were attached to the Ministry of Supply in 1958. Research stations are advised by scientists on the Advisory Council on Scientific Research and Technical Development, its boards and committees. These consist of expert physicists, chemists, engineers and so on, mainly from universities, who give specialist advice on research projects. The Aeronautical Research Council, and the Inter-Service Metallur-

gical Research Council have similar organisations and there were a large number of separate technical committees at the Ministry enabling it to keep pace with scientific advances on the numerous subjects of interest for defence supplies.

The Department of Scientific and Industrial Research has a number of Research Boards<sup>6</sup> which have advisory status, each responsible for Government research in a particular field of applied science. They have sufficient authority to be regarded as, in practice, administrative committees, and are not examined in this report. For similar reasons the Medical Research Council, the Agricultural Research Council, the Nature Conservancy and the new Overseas Research Council are not themselves examined. The Ministry of Power's Scientific Advisory Council has already been mentioned, and the former Colonial Research Council is discussed below. In addition, it must be remembered that many of the advisory committees at other departments described as "specialist" and so on are in fact scientific or technical committees.

#### COLONIAL COMMITTEES

The Colonial Office has built up an extensive system of advisory committees. Their function is usually to provide expert knowledge from Britain which administrators in the Colonies need. Though members often have colonial experience, this is not essential, for what most committees aim to provide is based on expert scientific knowledge or British experience. The Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies consists partly of members nominated by organisations with relevant experience and partly of members personally appointed, with an official element. The committee played a great part in forging educational policies for the colonies. The Advisory Committee on Co-operation in the Colonies is a similar body but is smaller and none of its members are nominated by organisations. It is still active and meets about three times a year. The Colonial Labour Advisory Committee, which has considered a variety of questions on the employment of labour and industrial relations in the Colonies in the post-war years, has probably passed the peak of its activity: it consists of British trade unionists, employers, and independent members with specialised experience. The Advisory Committee on Social

<sup>6</sup> Six of these have been replaced by small steering committees which decide research programmes, within general limits.



Development in the Colonies was formed in 1953 from the Social Welfare Advisory Committee, a committee on Mass Education and a sub-committee on Adult Education. It consists of civil servants, representatives of voluntary societies and university teachers. The Advisory Committee on Treatment of Offenders in the Colonies also continues to be active and important. Committees on Housing and Town Planning, and on Local Government have not been active *recently though advice on specific problems is still given by members*. The Committee on Native Law has recently been concerned with a conference on the Function of Law in Africa. The Colonial Agricultural Machinery Advisory Committee, set up in 1952, had a period of vigorous activity but has been less busy in the last few years. The work of the Consultative Committee on the Welfare of Colonial Students in the United Kingdom has been largely taken over by officers of the colonial governments.

Committees which are largely administrative in function include the Colonial University Grants Advisory Committee, which divides a block grant, and the East African and West African Currency Boards. The Colonial Research Council was concerned with the division of funds between various fields of research, and there are also a number of committees which approve particular research projects and supervise research from a scientific point of view.

The Commonwealth Relations Office has one important committee, the Oversea Migration Board. This is concerned with analysing and advising on policy relating to emigration from the United Kingdom to countries in the Commonwealth.

#### OTHER COMMITTEES

Other departments have, on the whole, fewer important committees. The Central Office of Information has only a few committees of which the Advisory Panel for Industrial Films is perhaps the most important. The Ministry of Works has three Historic Buildings Councils (for England, Wales and Scotland) and three Ancient Monuments Boards, all of which are concerned with administration and recording work, but which also make recommendations about action in specific cases. There are industrial consultative committees for Building and Civil Engineering and for the Stone Industry and an Advisory Committee on

gical Research Council have similar organisations and there were a large number of separate technical committees at the Ministry enabling it to keep pace with scientific advances on the numerous subjects of interest for defence supplies.

The Department of Scientific and Industrial Research has a number of Research Boards<sup>a</sup> which have advisory status, each responsible for Government research in a particular field of applied science. They have sufficient authority to be regarded as, in practice, administrative committees, and are not examined in this report. For similar reasons the Medical Research Council, the Agricultural Research Council, the Nature Conservancy and the new Overseas Research Council are not themselves examined. The Ministry of Power's Scientific Advisory Council has already been mentioned, and the former Colonial Research Council is discussed below. In addition, it must be remembered that many of the advisory committees at other departments described as "specialist" and so on are in fact scientific or technical committees.

#### COLONIAL COMMITTEES

The Colonial Office has built up an extensive system of advisory committees. Their function is usually to provide expert knowledge from Britain which administrators in the Colonies need. Though members often have colonial experience, this is not essential, for what most committees aim to provide is based on expert scientific knowledge or British experience. The Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies consists partly of members nominated by organisations with relevant experience and partly of members personally appointed, with an official element. The committee played a great part in forging educational policies for the colonies. The Advisory Committee on Co-operation in the Colonies is a similar body but is smaller and none of its members are nominated by organisations. It is still active and meets about three times a year. The Colonial Labour Advisory Committee, which has considered a variety of questions on the employment of labour and industrial relations in the Colonies in the post-war years, has probably passed the peak of its activity: it consists of British trade unionists, employers, and independent members with specialised experience. The Advisory Committee on Social

<sup>a</sup> Six of these have been replaced by small steering committees which decide research programmes, within general limits.

Development in the Colonies was formed in 1953 from the Social Welfare Advisory Committee, a committee on Mass Education and a sub-committee on Adult Education. It consists of civil servants, representatives of voluntary societies and university teachers. The Advisory Committee on Treatment of Offenders in the Colonies also continues to be active and important. Committees on Housing and Town Planning, and on Local Government have not been active recently though advice on specific problems is still given by members. The Committee on Native Law has recently been concerned with a conference on the Function of Law in Africa. The Colonial Agricultural Machinery Advisory Committee, set up in 1952, had a period of vigorous activity but has been less busy in the last few years. The work of the Consultative Committee on the Welfare of Colonial Students in the United Kingdom has been largely taken over by officers of the colonial governments.

Committees which are largely administrative in function include the Colonial University Grants Advisory Committee, which divides a block grant, and the East African and West African Currency Boards. The Colonial Research Council was concerned with the division of funds between various fields of research, and there are also a number of committees which approve particular research projects and supervise research from a scientific point of view.

The Commonwealth Relations Office has one important committee, the Oversea Migration Board. This is concerned with analysing and advising on policy relating to emigration from the United Kingdom to countries in the Commonwealth.

#### OTHER COMMITTEES

Other departments have, on the whole, fewer important committees. The Central Office of Information has only a few committees of which the Advisory Panel for Industrial Films is perhaps the most important. The Ministry of Works has three Historic Buildings Councils (for England, Wales and Scotland) and three Ancient Monuments Boards, all of which are concerned with administration and recording work, but which also make recommendations about action in specific cases. There are industrial consultative committees for Building and Civil Engineering and for the Stone Industry and an Advisory Committee on

Forestry. The Ministry is also advised by a Committee on Works of Art in the House of Commons. One committee is attached to the Lord Chancellor's Office: the Advisory Committee set up under the Legal Aid and Advice Act of 1949.

The Post Office has a few committees at national level, in addition to the 190 advisory committees in the main Post Office Areas. One of the most important is the Post Office Advisory Council which aims to act as a sounding board for general opinion on basic matters such as services, rates, and quality of service. Names are put forward by a variety of national organisations, but members serve as individuals not as representatives. It meets about three times a year at the invitation of the Postmaster General or on the initiative of members. Neither its membership nor reports on its work are published. All but one of the remaining committees are in the radio field. For example, the Frequency Advisory Committee, set up early in 1958, with members nominated by interested Government departments, users' organisations and the radio industry, advises on broad aspects of radio frequency planning. The Television Advisory Committee examines and advises on the broad technical issues of the development and planning of television and VHF sound broadcasting.

#### SCOTTISH COMMITTEES

There are over sixty advisory committees on Scottish affairs, meeting in Edinburgh, mainly at the Department of Health and the Home Department. Some of these, like the Scottish Health Services Council, the Scottish Advisory Council on Child Care and so on are similar to the corresponding bodies for England and Wales; but others such as the Advisory Council on Education in Scotland work very differently from committees with similar titles in England. The work of Scottish committees is discussed in a study of Scottish and Welsh committees later in the report.

## PROBLEMS OF COMPOSITION

WHAT is aimed at in composing an advisory committee? To some extent this can be answered by considering the basic characteristics of committees. Committees are, strictly, bodies to which some function is delegated by a higher authority and they are distinguished from casual groups by having a purpose and a rudimentary constitution. Normally, there is an element of continuity—that is to say they meet more than once. Obviously, Government advisory committees depend in part for their effectiveness on the solution of problems of composition common to all committees.

These may be described as the problems of quality, of balance, of harmony, and of external prestige. Committees are usually better than a mere collection of individuals; but they cannot entirely transcend the abilities of the persons who compose them. Individual merit must therefore be a primary consideration, not to be lost sight of, when a committee is being set up.

However valuable a person's potential contribution, the fullest benefit will not be obtained from it unless it is combined with that of others. For this purpose it is desirable that the various talents and the specialised qualifications of committee members should combine to produce a properly-balanced group. What is a proper balance can only be understood in relation to what is expected of the committee but it is often necessary to achieve a balance between conflicting points of view. This may complicate matters, for another desideratum for committee work is harmony—a committee is in a sense also a team. The necessary differences between members should not, therefore, be such as to hamper co-operation on the committee or turn discussion into continuous argument, and thus to destroy its internal effectiveness.<sup>1</sup>

A well-balanced, harmonious committee with a membership of a high quality should naturally carry great weight. But it may be

<sup>1</sup> Expert committees trying to produce agreed reports have a greater need of harmony than consultative committees for general discussion; but there is a degree of disharmony disastrous to any committee.

reinforced, and its effectiveness increased, by the deliberate cultivation of prestige. It is worth emphasising that, other things being equal, the work of a committee will often attract more support if its members are well-known in their fields and command respect and confidence, both in specialist circles and with wider public opinion.

It is very rare for there to be open complaints about the general quality of members on advisory committees. But though sometimes committees provide a means whereby people of very high ability can play a part in the work of government, it does not follow that they necessarily consist of all the most brilliant or most powerful individuals concerned with the subject: indeed, the brilliant person who is unrepresentative or out of touch may be unsuitable. Industrial organisations or other bodies may decide that a particular committee does not need the attention of the very best man available. An experienced committee-server or an "elder statesman" will do. This may not matter very much where the business of the committee is to collate various points of view and secure general co-operation. But it is important to remember that individual merit cannot be constantly sacrificed to other factors in the make-up of a committee without jeopardising the result. In the following paragraphs a good deal is said about other matters—about balance, harmony and prestige—how they are secured, and how they contribute to the various objectives which the establishment of the committee may have. None of these devices will avail, however, if the members are all second-rate.

#### METHODS OF RECRUITMENT

There has now grown up a wide variety of practices in recruiting advisory committees. This variety is required by the varying functions of the committees (described in Chapter Two), and by the varying objectives they are expected to serve. An examination of these practices will show, therefore, more than differences of procedure dictated by reasons of convenience: it will illustrate to some extent the real expectations of the Government and, often, of other organised groups. These expectations are based on considerable experience and they may form a useful starting point in considering the impact which advisory committees have made.

In some cases, of course, there may be statutory rules about

appointment. These may prescribe the composition of virtually the whole committee (especially in the case of negotiating committees), or merely ensure the representation of certain interests. In most cases, however, the selection of the individual is left open—only rarely are there *ex officio* members, like the Presidents of the Royal Colleges and others on the Central Health Services Council. There is no difference of principle between the composition of a committee fixed by statute and those not so fixed—the statute merely lays down in particular cases the sort of pattern found elsewhere.

*Members of advisory committees are almost always appointed by the Minister or Secretary of State. A few, like the Political Honours Scrutiny Committee, are appointed by the Prime Minister. Three broad types of recruitment can be distinguished—that where independent bodies send representatives; various degrees of nomination and suggestion of names; and the method of direct contact. These will be discussed in turn.*

### *Representatives*

There are cases where the committee, strictly speaking, has no individual members. The Consultative Committee for Industry at the Board of Trade, for example, is brought together by inviting a number of national industrial organisations to send representatives. The invitations are re-issued for each meeting; the organisations are under no obligation to send the same people to successive meetings; and no precise number of representatives is stipulated. In fact, the organisations usually send the same representatives, and there is hence considerable continuity of membership. The Civil Defence Industrial Advisory Panel at the Home Office had similar arrangements, but it has not met for some years.

On many other important committees the position is only a little different. There is individual membership of the National Production Advisory Council on Industry, but these individuals are nominated by the industrial organisations concerned; and they are regarded as speaking for the organisation which sends them. Before the changes of November 1959 they could be accompanied by others, who could also speak, and substitution was freely allowed. On the National Joint Advisory Council at the Ministry of Labour there are seventeen members from the British Employers' Confederation, seventeen from the Trades Union Congress

and six from the nationalised industries, but all groups may bring substitutes or additional representatives.

It is obvious that those who sit on two-sided negotiating committees like the Burnham Committees or the Police Council for Great Britain must in practice be representatives of the organisations and interests concerned even though they may be personally appointed: indeed, if they are very closely mandated they are delegates. On other types of advisory committee the degree to which members represent their organisations varies: trade unionists often seem to regard themselves more as representatives than do businessmen—on the Engineering Advisory Council, for example.

This highly flexible system puts the organisations in a strong position. Those who attend may or may not be briefed by the organisations, but in any case it is on their position as accredited representatives that the effectiveness of the committee depends. By constituting committees in this way, the Government frankly acknowledges that the organisations are the effective spokesmen for the relevant interests in the community, and that the need for the representation of those interests on some committees overrides personal or other considerations. Direct representation of organisations is therefore appropriate in these cases.

### *Nominations and suggestions*

Probably the majority of members of advisory committees are appointed, not as direct representatives, but through some form of nomination or suggestion from outside bodies. The connection with the organisation varies considerably, and there are many different conventions concerning the method of recruitment.

A number of committees have a practice fairly close to direct representation. The National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers at the Ministry of Education has forty-nine members, nominated largely by teachers' organisations and by associations of local authorities. The members serve as individuals for a fixed period of three years: but the Minister always appoints the persons nominated by the organisations, and they are regarded in the main as representatives. The manufacturers on the Machine Tool Advisory Council are nominated by the Machine Tool Trades Association, and the manufacturers on the National Advisory Council for the Motor Manufacturing Industry are in practice nominated by the Society of Motor Manufacturers and



Traders; and the trade unionists in both cases are nominated by the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions.

The difference in practice between a situation like this and direct representation is small. Once nominated and appointed, a member has a place on the committee in his own right; but the point of the system is that the organisations will only nominate persons in whom they have confidence. The line which the nominees take is *not necessarily worked out in their organisation, but nevertheless they are expected to speak from the general point of view of the group which puts them forward.* Again the confidence and participation of these groups is felt to be more important than the selection of members on personal grounds by the Minister and his civil servants.

A variant of this method gives the Minister more scope. The relevant organisations may be asked, not for a single nomination, but for a list of three or four names. This enables a choice to be made on personal or other grounds: in particular, it enables considerations like the internal harmony of the committee, its inter-regional balance, and the individual preferences of the Minister to be taken into account.

The Central Health Services Council appears to be appointed in this manner. The National Health Service Act of 1946 lays down detailed rules for the composition of the Council, and thirty-five of its members are appointed after consultation with appropriate representative organisations. The Minister of Health is bound to consult, therefore, but takes care to have the last word in appointments, and is not confined in his choice to those suggested. Other committees where this procedure is used, at least on some occasions, include the Central Housing Advisory Committee.

In fact, the most common situation is one of informal consultation. The appointments are made in a personal capacity, but beforehand the Minister or his civil servants make enquiries—by telephone, by meeting or by letter—from relevant organisations. In these cases nobody can claim a right to be consulted, or to have their suggestions accepted. Prominent individuals as well as organisations may be asked to put forward names. The Minister in theory preserves complete freedom of choice, but he may well find it prudent to meet the wishes of the organisations. These are likely to feel just as aggrieved if their suggestions are frequently ignored as if they are not consulted at all. It is here that the external prestige

of the committee must be considered; the first aim must always be for a committee to work well, but it is also necessary to get the results of its work accepted. It may help to do this, if, right at the beginning, individuals are appointed whose reputations carry weight in the circles concerned. One expedient is to choose deliberately the eminent and the well-known; another (not necessarily contradictory) is to follow closely the initial suggestions of the relevant interests.

Committees where this sort of procedure occurs are numerous. The Central Advisory Water Committee and committees at the Colonial Office such as the Committee on Social Development in the Colonies are examples. But it would be more realistic to describe this method as the normal one—as the way things are done when there are no strong reasons for doing them otherwise. It is probable that the majority of advisory committees—certainly those classified as “expert committees” in Chapter Two—are built up by this style of informal consultation.

### *Direct contact*

Sometimes it is said that appointments are strictly personal and that committee members have not been nominated by anyone. But since the personal acquaintance of any Minister, however gregarious, must be limited, it is obvious that he must rely at least on his civil servants, and perhaps on friends and party colleagues. Apparently the Treasury keeps a central list of names, which departments may consult.<sup>1</sup> Ministers and civil servants always know some people who are suitable for service on a particular committee; the difficulty is for them to establish or maintain a full committee—with a proper balance, internal harmony and external prestige—without consulting anyone.

The Central Advisory Council for Education (England) shows an attempt to avoid nomination by the organised interest groups. To secure the necessary balance, therefore, the suggestions of civil servants, Her Majesty's Inspectors, and their immediate contacts are used. For the recruitment of the Advisory Council on Scientific

<sup>1</sup> See Oral Evidence to the Franks Committee, Fourth day, page 110, question 931. Major J. Morrison, M.P., asked why the Treasury was consulted about the appointment of non-lawyers to tribunals. Sir Gilmour Jenkins, of the Ministry of Transport, replied: “Because they have a comprehensive list of likely people to be used for this and various other kinds of public service.”

Research and Technical Development and its boards and committees the Minister must rely largely on the direct acquaintance and knowledge of civil servants and of existing members of the committees. It is probably true to say that where the advice needed is of highly specialist character the necessary experts are likely to be recruited through individual contacts at universities and so on.

### *Mixed methods*

More than one style of recruitment may be used to constitute the same committee. The Postmaster General's Television Advisory Committee contains the Directors General of the BBC and the ITA, and members from the radio manufacturing industry, but it also contains a number of independent members who are appointed by the method just described as "direct contact". The National Insurance Advisory Committee contains four members appointed at the Minister's discretion in addition to those appointed after consultation with employers, trade unions, friendly societies and Northern Irish authorities. The Advisory Council on Scientific Policy contains seven independent scientists who are personally appointed after informal consultation; the others are appointed virtually *ex officio* as holders of official positions, for example, the secretaries of the four Research Councils.

It is possible to make only a very rough generalisation about these various methods of recruitment: that the more direct methods of representation or nomination are used, necessarily, where the aim of the committee is a major concern of strong interest groups. These cannot easily be by-passed or overawed by an expert committee, privately and informally recruited. It is sometimes hoped to do this, and there have been successes; but the main evidence is that failure to satisfy groups about the composition of a committee will only lead to difficulties and controversy about its work. In quieter areas, less subject to the conflict of pressure groups, private methods of recruitment are naturally more easily pursued. Where there is difference between what the groups might like and what the department might prefer (for example, a committee of representatives may only produce weak compromises) arrangements like the mixtures just mentioned, and the "Other Aids to Effectiveness" described on page 44, come into play. But it is first necessary to make clear some points about the

counterpart to the method of recruitment: the relationship of the member, when serving on the committee, to outside organisations, and to interested non-members generally.

#### RELATIONS OF MEMBERS WITH OUTSIDE GROUPS

On committees consisting of representatives, the relationship of members with the organisation from which they come is clear enough—they are assumed to put forward the views of that organisation. But there is rarely any question of committing the organisation to the decisions of the committee or even to the views they put forward themselves. For one thing, these committees are mostly consultative in character, and no attempt to reach agreement is made and no decisions taken; and secondly, it is realised that spontaneous remarks are not the same thing as long-run considered policy. For the committee to fulfill its purpose at all, however, statements made at its meetings must be reasonably authoritative. This may often be a question of confidence and general contact, particularly in businessmen's organisations. That is to say there may be no special briefing, but by their normal work on the organisations' committees, for example, the representatives know the likely attitudes of their fellows, and to a considerable extent the organisations are prepared to follow their lead. This is the situation on the employers' side of the Consultative Committee for Industry, for example.

But in other cases more deliberate steps are taken to work out the attitude to be taken. The employers' side of the National Advisory Council for the Motor Manufacturing Industry meets in the morning before the Council meets in the afternoon and the employers on the Engineering Advisory Council co-ordinate their views beforehand. Members of the National Production Advisory Council on Industry are assumed to take soundings with their colleagues in the various groups about any proposals or policies that arise; the TUC is represented in any case from its Production Committee, which discusses topics likely to be raised at the NPACI as a matter of course. The groups on the National Joint Advisory Council at the Ministry of Labour have spokesmen whose line is broadly agreed within the group. On negotiating committees an attitude worked out beforehand is obviously necessary.

This co-ordination among committee members is normally

more the preoccupation of those members than of the organisations generally. On the whole, it is the practice for the actual representatives themselves to judge how far it is necessary to keep in touch with opinion in their organisations, rather than for the organisation deliberately to inform its representatives about policy. Thus representatives on some committees report back to either the governing body or a particular committee of the nominating organisation as they feel necessary. Even if there is a regular report they mention such topics as seem significant.

For the most part, however, as has been explained, members of expert committees and administrative committees are not representatives; they may be nominees or they may be privately recruited. So far as the nominees are concerned the appointments are always personal ones and the views expressed are taken to be their own. They are under no commitment to present the attitude of the body which suggested their name; on the contrary, it is their duty to argue matters as they themselves see fit. Nevertheless, the work put into selecting a balanced committee would be wasted, and the system would not work if everyone tried to purge his mind of prior assumptions.

It would be improper, therefore, for a nominated member to act as the mouthpiece of an outside body or to reveal details of a committee's proceedings. But the rules of confidence (described in Chapter Four) rarely preclude general discussion of topics with which the committee is dealing. It is not necessary for a committee member to cut himself from his natural contacts, nor need he deprive himself of counsel or knowledge from these sources. He should not seek actual instructions, but usually he may talk to his colleagues in his office, fellow-members of his organisation, people in his university department and so on.

On the other hand, no association or firm or union has any rights over a nominee. Some nominees may choose to work closely with their nominators: trade unionists often do. But there is no doubt that the organisations are sometimes displeased with what their nominees support, and that the independence of the member is not merely theoretical. Organisations may take the view that persons nominated by them ought to see that their views are considered, that evidence submitted by them to the committee is weighed carefully, for example, but this is the most they expect.

They appreciate that their nominee may find that other evidence outweighs their own.

Where the rules of secrecy are stricter, as with the Economic Planning Board (a nominated committee) or the Advisory Council on Scientific Research and Technical Development at the Ministry of Supply (which is recruited by direct contacts), then the maintenance of liaison with outside is difficult. Members of such committees cannot deliberately seek views or knowledge relevant to a forthcoming agenda. They must rely on the fact that they work in an atmosphere where it is natural to acquire such information.

The relations of committee members with outside bodies are, therefore, generally speaking, characterised by informality and flexibility. Such formal rules as there are do not press heavily; common understanding between Government, committee members, and independent organisations is much more important. The conclusion to be inferred, then, is that committee members must be above all persons in whom the nominating bodies can have confidence; and in the nature of things the venturesome and the unorthodox rarely earn this confidence. This psychological mechanism, between the committee member and the nominating organisation, has a further link—between the organisations themselves and the groups they represent, their “clientele”. Where the organisations have been by-passed by an attempt at “direct contact” recruitment, this confidence needs to exist directly between the committee-member and the community—employers, workers, scientists, teachers, local councillors, Welshmen, or whoever it may be—from which he is drawn. A committee member cannot be controlled: he must be trusted.

#### OTHER AIDS TO EFFECTIVENESS

Besides these basic methods of composition, certain other devices are used to aid the effectiveness of the committees. The use of these devices is not confined, of course, to advisory bodies: many of them are expedients found in a great variety of groups all over the world.

##### *Independent chairmen*

It is a well-known practice with many types of body for the chairmanship to be held by someone who is not directly involved

in the interests concerned. The importance of this depends on the functions appertaining in practice to the post. In some cases he may be able to give leadership and direction to the whole concern; in others he may just be there to guide a group through an agenda, owing his position to an irreconcilable conflict about an inside chairman.

Government advisory committees employ this type of chairman only in a minority of cases. In a sense, of course, civil servants and Ministers may be regarded as neutral chairmen where there are conflicting groups—say employers and trade unionists—on a committee. But they are not independent in the sense of being outside controversies, for it is the Government's policies or possible policies that are under discussion. Genuinely independent chairmen are much rarer. Sir Geoffrey Crowther is at present chairman of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England) though he is an economist rather than an educational expert. The chairman of the Machine Tool Advisory Council was Vice-Admiral Sir Harold Brown who was neither an employer nor a trade unionist. On the Television Advisory Committee Admiral Sir Charles Daniel is independent chairman and on the Cinematograph Films Council one of the six independent members, Sir Sydney Roberts, is chairman. Mr. K. J. P. Barraclough, a magistrate, is chairman of the Poisons Board, which consists largely of pharmacists and other scientists. In 1959 Mr. Ronald Groves, the Master of Dulwich College, was appointed chairman of the Food Standards Committee.

Negotiating committees sometimes need independent chairmen. The Police Council for Great Britain has an independent chairman appointed by the Prime Minister, contrasting with the statutory Police Council (which is not a two-sided negotiating body) where the Permanent Under Secretary of State of the Home Office or occasionally another senior official is chairman. All the Burnham Committees have the same independent chairman, nominated by the Minister, but actually appointed by the Committees themselves. Other committees in the administrative category have less need for chairmen who are markedly more "independent" than the other members.

Vigorous leadership from an independent chairman may be possible, but it is not often easy. The scope of a committee may be limited by its terms of reference, and the Ministers and civil

servants who set it up probably have firm ideas about the purposes they want it to serve. The situations in which an advisory committee needs, and gets, an independent chairman with room for initiative are therefore of rare occurrence.

### *Laymen*

There is a practice of appointing to some committees independent persons as additions to the main body. These members are designed to break potential deadlock, to prevent discussion degenerating into argument, to contribute unbiased judgments, and to make sure the committee sees the wood as well as the trees. Where necessary they may help to protect wider interests—consumers, the general public—than are represented by the main body. They are here described as “laymen” to distinguish them from the experts, specialists, representatives and so on who constitute the bulk of any committee. A person may, of course, be a “layman” on one committee but a representative or an expert in other circumstances, on other committees.

The presence of three such members, in addition to the chairman, on the Television Advisory Committee has already been mentioned. The National Advisory Council for the Motor Manufacturing Industry has had an independent member (formerly a shoe manufacturer, now a professor of economics) since 1957. The Machine Tool Advisory Council had in 1958 two independents, a trade unionist not connected with the industry and a businessman from the electronics industry. The National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers has four members appointed at the Minister's discretion, as well as the nominated members. There are special categories of “Minister's nominees” or “independents” on committees like the Central Advisory Committee on Artificial Insemination and the Advisory Committee on the Provincial Agricultural Economics Service at the Ministry of Agriculture. But in some cases specially nominated persons are experts on committees of representatives—they are not laymen in the sense of “amateurs” or non-specialists.

Though the principle is well-known, there is no need for laymen on most advisory committees and the question of their appointment does not arise. They are only appointed in a few cases where there are special circumstances making their presence desirable.



*Civil servants*

There are civil servants on almost all advisory committees. Their position on consultative committees has been made plain in Chapter Two. They constitute a large element in any consultative committee, and it is their function to discuss the attitude of their departments to industrial and other problems with representatives of the groups present. The place of civil servants on other committees is not so obvious.

There is, of course, a secretariat. This is discussed in Chapter Four; in the main it is true to say that the secretary and his assistants are most important on those committees where there are no other Government representatives. He may then play a real part in the work of the committee; more especially he will transmit the views of his department to the committee and explain technicalities of the Government machine to them. He can also act as the committee's spokesman and interpreter in the department.

Some committees within the scope of this report have a large majority of civil servants. A few, indeed, are virtually inter-departmental committees, brought inside the definition by the presence of a few members from outside the civil service. The Interdepartmental Committee on Social and Economic Research at the Treasury, for instance, has ten civil servants to four outside members, and the Ministry of Labour's Retail Prices Index Technical Committee has two outside people with six officials.

It is much more typical, however, to find a group of civil servants, in a clear minority, on an expert or administrative committee. Normally, they come from several other departments besides the sponsoring one; and very often they are professional or scientific officials rather than administrators. Thus, members of the National Agricultural Advisory Service play an important part on the committees of the Agricultural Improvement Council and the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research provides members of many committees—for example, the Committee on the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil. Scientific civil servants may be in a different position to administrators. Administrative civil servants necessarily present departmental policy but scientific ones may be called upon either to provide expert knowledge or to express the views of the scientific organisations which employ them.

Administrative class civil servants are important on committees

servants who set it up probably have firm ideas about the purposes they want it to serve. The situations in which an advisory committee needs, and gets, an independent chairman with room for initiative are therefore of rare occurrence.

### *Laymen*

There is a practice of appointing to some committees independent persons as additions to the main body. These members are designed to break potential deadlock, to prevent discussion degenerating into argument, to contribute unbiased judgments, and to make sure the committee sees the wood as well as the trees. Where necessary they may help to protect wider interests—consumers, the general public—than are represented by the main body. They are here described as “laymen” to distinguish them from the experts, specialists, representatives and so on who constitute the bulk of any committee. A person may, of course, be a “layman” on one committee but a representative or an expert in other circumstances, on other committees.

The presence of three such members, in addition to the chairman, on the Television Advisory Committee has already been mentioned. The National Advisory Council for the Motor Manufacturing Industry has had an independent member (formerly a shoe manufacturer, now a professor of economics) since 1957. The Machine Tool Advisory Council had in 1958 two independents, a trade unionist not connected with the industry and a businessman from the electronics industry. The National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers has four members appointed at the Minister's discretion, as well as the nominated members. There are special categories of “Minister's nominees” or “independents” on committees like the Central Advisory Committee on Artificial Insemination and the Advisory Committee on the Provincial Agricultural Economics Service at the Ministry of Agriculture. But in some cases specially nominated persons are experts on committees of representatives—they are not laymen in the sense of “amateurs” or non-specialists.

Though the principle is well-known, there is no need for laymen on most advisory committees and the question of their appointment does not arise. They are only appointed in a few cases where there are special circumstances making their presence desirable.

sentation on appropriate committees and the related question of the geographical distribution of members generally. There is a need to resist the temptation to appoint people who live in or near London because they will be able to attend more easily. In some cases it is thought desirable to make special arrangements for the appointment of women.<sup>3</sup> On some occasions it is prudent to share membership among the appropriate institutions—between Oxford, Cambridge and other universities for example. Differing schools of thought may have to be balanced, and in some cases thinly-disguised political differences; for example, the inclusion of both left-wing and right-wing economists is sometimes thought necessary. Age composition may be considered: it would not do for a committee to be composed entirely of the very young or very old.

These factors appear very complicated; nevertheless, the evidence is that they are largely left to sort themselves out. In practice, too, they do largely sort themselves out—that is to say, an advisory committee is built up with its primary type of balance in mind (the various interests concerned, the relevant types of expert) and in the event an adequate balance of other factors emerges. But on occasion attention must be given to these subsidiary matters, and it is then important that a Minister should at least be able to vary the nominations which come before him.

### *Rotation*

It is the custom to appoint members of some advisory committees for an indefinite period. This is the case with various consultative committees—the Economic Planning Board, for instance. Members usually, but not always, go on until they retire, change jobs, and so on. In some instances, members have continued on committees even after retirement from active work—on the Central Advisory Water Committee for example.

For a majority of advisory committees, however, there are stricter conditions. On the Colonial Research Council members were not reappointed after they had retired from their academic, research or other position. Most committees have fixed terms of appointment, and though reappointment is usually possible, some

<sup>3</sup> The National Insurance Act, 1946, prescribes, for the National Insurance Advisory Committee, that "At least one member of the Committee shall be a woman".

too numerous to be indicated by examples. Sometimes they may be the driving force on a committee—or, at any rate, they privately believe this to be the case. But it is to be noted that the relative informality of committee procedure enables them to participate to the full in its work. Sometimes neither they nor others on the committee are sure whether they are properly “members” of the committee or are merely attending in some other undefined capacity. It does not matter. They certainly speak in any discussion. Voting on most advisory committees is virtually unknown and there are usually no reports to be signed. In a few cases their status is made clear—on the Central Advisory Water Committee, for example, they are “assessors” and do not sign reports to the Minister. On the Advisory Council on Child Care four civil servants are members, while others attend the meetings as observers.

The point of having civil servants, as such, on advisory committees is that by this means the committee can have constant guidance about ways and means, about what is practicable and what is not, and so on. They can help to keep the committee on the right lines from the department’s point of view—to make sure that it attends to the problems the department wants, even if it does not provide the desired answers. A committee can be reminded about general Government policy, and a department can be warned of the trend of a committee’s thinking before it reports. The civil servants can also make sure that the committee is aware of the resources of a department, and also that these resources are made available to the committee. Without civil servants the independence of the committee may be more obvious; but its reports and suggestions may be less relevant and less feasible. And, of course, civil servants are there for their personal qualities—through long and constant preoccupation, they are often leading authorities on a particular subject.

### *Subsidiary balances*

Something has already been said earlier in this chapter about the importance of securing a properly-balanced committee. This is not only a question of arranging the obvious categories properly, however; it is a great aid to the effectiveness and prestige of committees if subsidiary balances can also be well contrived.

There is, for example, the question of Scottish and Welsh repre-

not deliberately co-opted by the committee as a whole. Substitutes are allowed on some committees; the Advisory Council on Scientific Policy has occasionally invited the Deputy Secretary of the DSIR to attend its meetings when the Secretary was unable to be present. Other persons may be invited to attend meetings from time to time to discuss particular items. Co-option is used for sub-committees of the Central Housing Advisory Committee and the Central Advisory Water Committee, for the committees of the Central Health Services Council, and for the sub-committees of the Standing Advisory Committees at the Ministry of Health.

#### SIZE AND SERVICE

When any new committee is established its size has to be fixed. Government advisory committees appear to range at present from the seventy-nine of the National Advisory Council on Education for Industry and Commerce, or the sixty-four on the Treasury's Advisory Council on Export of Works of Art, to three, four or five on some specialist committees, or nine or ten on important committees like the National Insurance Advisory Committee or the Colonial Research Council.<sup>4</sup>

If the committee is to be a representative one, its size will be decided in the first place by the number of interests involved, and the need to balance them fairly—a powerful group may reasonably expect three or four times the number of members as a smaller organisation or one with only a peripheral concern in the subject. Similarly, an expert committee may *prima facie* need a certain number of different types of specialist. But these factors may well be overridden by functional considerations: if a committee is to fulfill its purpose it must be of a size capable of doing so. Where an expert committee is to go into some detail and to consider papers and draft reports carefully, it must be limited in size—more than a dozen, perhaps, is risky. With larger numbers it becomes more and more difficult to get through an agenda, since each person has points to make and suggestions to offer. On consultative committees and others where discussion of general principles is the main function, or where more detailed and precise work can be delegated to sub-committees, a larger number of

<sup>4</sup> The Standing Conference of Co-operating Bodies on Atmospheric Pollution, at the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, has 390 members: but it is obviously not a committee in the usual sense.

changes at least are made. Three years seems to be the standard term of appointment although it is five years for the National Insurance Advisory Committee and four is the maximum for the Central Advisory Water Committee. The members of the Committee on Social Development in the Colonies are reappointed annually. Mostly it is the practice to reconstitute the committee completely, including reappointments, at the appropriate intervals. One-third of the Central Health Services Council, however, retires annually. The reappointment of members is usually possible, but on the Central Housing Advisory Committee this does not go beyond a second term in most cases. Independent members of the Advisory Council on Scientific Policy have on occasion been asked to continue for a second period of office but with the Advisory Council for Scientific Research and Technical Development at the Ministry of Supply reappointment is impossible for at least one year after the three-year period of service. Members of the committees attached to this Council may serve for six years, but it is then compulsory for them to stand down. So strict a system as this is very rare.

The practice of rotation has purpose both in terms of the internal effectiveness and the external prestige of the committees; it is not merely a matter of "Buggins' turn". Internally, a committee is improved by having fresh minds and possibly new ideas brought in, and newcomers do not feel committed to previous decisions, to attitudes taken up in the past. On bodies concerned with scientific research the problems may change so rapidly that the introduction of new specialists is an urgent consideration. Rules about rotation provide an easy way—without causing ill-feeling—of eliminating members who no longer take an active part in the work of a committee. Externally, change helps to spread awareness of the committee and its work in the circles most concerned with it, and prevents it from being regarded as a narrow clique.

#### *Co-option*

The practice of co-opting additional members, in a formal sense at least, has little importance for advisory committees. It has already been explained that on various consultative committees, like the National Production Advisory Council on Industry, no objection was made (before the changes of November 1959) if extra individuals accompanied the various groups, but they were

nautical Research Council, of the Interservice Metallurgical Research Council, and of the boards and committees attached to these Councils, normally receive fees, and so do members of the Meteorological Research Committee at the Air Ministry. A few other scientific or technical committees, at the Ministry of Supply and elsewhere, fall into this category. Two or three committees at the Ministry of Housing, like the Advisory Committee on Ironstone Restoration, perhaps involve not scientists but professional valuers, surveyors and so on. The other important advisory committees where payment is made are the University Grants Committee, the National Insurance Advisory Committee, the Industrial Injuries Advisory Council, and the Air Transport Advisory Council.

The explanation of these payments is probably in all cases, scientific and otherwise, that members spend a considerable length of time on the committee's work. The fact that professional services, of scientists and others, are involved may be a consideration in some cases. The fees paid are normally so much per day. There are no annual salaries or retainers for members of committees, but occasionally chairmen who have to spend much of their time on the work receive a salary. There is an overriding annual maximum for service on all Government committees.

In the main, however, no salaries, fees or compensations are paid for service on advisory committees, on the grounds that "it is important to maintain the principle of voluntary public service". In some cases payment would be inappropriate because committee members are representing outside organisations, and such service is part of their official duties. Expenses are almost always payable—normally, travelling expenses and subsistence allowances on the scale appropriate to senior civil servants.

#### PLURALITY OF MEMBERSHIP

The most popular allegation about Government committees is that the same persons are appointed to them over and over again. Certain favoured individuals, it is alleged, sit on many committees; and, by inference, other people who might serve are for some reason neglected. "Round how many separate Ministerial conference tables are to be found the same convex waistcoats and bloodshot eyes?" asked the *New Statesman*.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> December 1957. In a comment on the PEP broadsheet *The Growth of Government* (PLANNING No. 417).

members is possible. Where debate lies between groups rather than individuals the actual numbers attending may be flexible, or are fixed arbitrarily. In some cases, such as the NPACI or the NJAC, it seems that many are present in order to listen as much as to participate actively. The effect of size on procedure is mentioned in Chapter Four.

### *Willingness to serve*

Are there any difficulties in persuading people to serve on advisory committees, if invited? There are no indications of very serious problems. So far as consultative committees are concerned, members are usually drawn from those active in the various organisations; and whether they are elected office-bearers or paid officials, they accept service on Government committees as part of their functions. On expert and administrative committees the chance to be of influence is a sufficient inducement. In a few cases, membership of a Government committee for, say, a teacher, a social worker, or a local administrator may carry considerable personal prestige, and may even enhance career prospects. For scientists service on advisory bodies connected with the Colonial Research Council, the Agricultural Improvement Council and so on, is closely connected with the general work of their careers, and as such is willingly undertaken.

It would be wrong to imply that there are no difficulties at all. Sometimes invitations may be declined by businessmen, academics and others on grounds of "pressure of work". If this pressure consists in service on many other committees, then their refusal is no doubt to be welcomed. But it may arise from other duties. Some trade associations, containing numbers of small firms, find it difficult to put forward people with adequate time to spare. In other cases, organisations need to resist the temptation to nominate their readily-available paid officials on all occasions. There have been very rare refusals to serve on committees concerned with defence research on pacifist grounds.

### *Fees and expenses*

Very few members of advisory committees are paid. Bodies where payment is made are predominantly scientific in character. At the Ministry of Supply members of the Advisory Council on Scientific Research and Technical Development, of the Aero-



tions of nominating the same persons to groups of committees. The nominations of these organisations to the five committees concerned with police matters, in particular, provide many pluralists, including most of those serving on three or four committees. Similarly, some local authority association nominees serve on two committees concerned with fire brigades. Apart from persons connected with these and similar organisations there are perhaps under ten pluralists.

### *Members of Board of Trade committees*

The members of twenty-six Board of Trade advisory committees were considered. Those that did not meet at all in 1958 were ignored. The Consultative Committee for Industry does not officially have a regular membership, but those attending for a particular meetings in 1958 were counted as members. Civil servants from any department were again excluded, and so were persons listed as "advisers", "observers", etc.

There are 286 places on the twenty-six committees occupied by 262 individuals. The numbers on more than one committee were:

<i>three</i>	<i>two</i>
<i>committees</i>	<i>committees</i>
2	20

This means that 46 places were taken by pluralists, or one place in every six.

This is rather less than at the Home Office. There is nothing at the Board of Trade to correspond to the block of local authority association nominees. Nevertheless, both persons serving on three committees are organisation nominees—in this case trade unionists. Those serving on two committees include prominent industrialists, trade association officials, and one or two trade unionists.

### *Causes of plurality*

The evidence from two departments cannot be decisive, but there is no reason to think them untypical. In both cases it was the practice of nomination by outside organisations that led to most of the plurality; but there was also a number of persons privately appointed who served on two (rarely more) committees. Individuals are not, of course, confined to service with the committees of one department. At least one person on a Home Office committee serves, as an "independent layman", on a Board of Trade

It is not possible to give here a complete analysis of the situation.\* In the first place any examination confined to advisory committees neglects all the independent administrative or executive bodies; all the quasi-judicial tribunals; and all the regional and local bodies such as the Regional Boards for Industry and various consumer committees. This is to say nothing of local authorities, and nothing of the councils and committees of trade associations, trade unions and professional bodies who may at times be close to the Government machine. Secondly, comprehensive statistical work on the full range of advisory committees has not been practicable. To cover all the committees in Study V would involve checking each of perhaps 5,000 or 6,000 names against every other name, and this has not been attempted.

Two Government departments, however, the Board of Trade and the Home Office, have provided lists of names, and the situation on the advisory committees of these departments is analysed below.

#### *Members of Home Office committees*

For the Home Office, the members of twenty-three advisory committees were considered. The Advisory Council on Child Care and the Central Training Council in Child Care were treated as one committee since their non-official membership is identical. The statutory Police Council and the Police Council for Great Britain were also treated as one, their membership so far as England and Wales are concerned being nearly identical. Civil servants from any department have been excluded wherever identified. This leaves 337 places on the twenty-three committees, and these are filled by 276 individuals. The number of "pluralists"—persons sitting on more than one committee—is as follows:

<i>four committees</i>	<i>three committees</i>	<i>two committees</i>
4	9	21

This means that eighty-five places are occupied by pluralists, or about one place in every four.

Much of this can be attributed to the practice of the County Councils' Association and the Association of Municipal Corpora-

\* An analysis of multiplicity of membership on various Government industrial bodies in 1951 is given in *Government and Industry* (PEP), 1952, p. 131.

served on other research committees at that department. The membership of various committees overlaps, that is to say, because the interests of the committees overlap. This is a deliberate administrative device, found in many different fields and not either originated by or particularly prevalent on Government advisory committees.

Other reasons can only be suggested. Partly, plurality may arise because there is quite genuinely a limited circle of "availability" for certain appointments—often, paradoxically, of the independent layman type. But it is difficult to resist the conclusion that habit and caution play at least some part. At the outset of this chapter it was emphasised that internal harmony and balance were vital considerations in committee composition. To meet these considerations the appointing Minister and his civil servants need personal knowledge, not merely second-hand recommendation, and clearly those who already serve on one committee are known while others may not be. Places on committees are not prizes to be divided out by some impartial standard; and a Minister appointing a committee will naturally prefer persons he knows will contribute to its success. Whitehall is usually anxious to avoid appointing familiar figures. The difficulty is for those concerned to get to know of others with the right capacity and experience.

### *Consequences of plurality*

Since many persons are appointed to more than one committee on administrative grounds, it is to be expected that the practice will facilitate smooth administration. Certainly it enables co-ordination to be effected simply and without elaborate paper work. Moreover, even where there is no deliberate co-ordination, the use of experienced committee members may well enhance the internal effectiveness of advisory bodies.

Nevertheless, there is much to be said against the practice. It is notorious that some individuals serve on too many committees, including advisory committees. A person who may add prestige and foster harmony on a committee may not in fact give it the attention or original thought that a less practised figure might give. Experience is not the only worthwhile committee quality, and playing safe may lead to mediocrity. If an organisation tries to concentrate outside committee work in the hands of one person, then this person becomes merely the retailer of his colleagues'

committee; another, on two Home Office committees, is also on a Colonial Office committee; and, similarly, combinations of Board of Trade and Colonial Office, Home Office and Health, National Insurance and Colonies, Agriculture and Health and so on can readily be found. Plurality is not entirely, or even mainly, intra-departmental.

If this is taken into account, it can be seen that there are some grounds for the suspicions that plurality is excessive. Its extent must not be exaggerated, for it would probably be impossible to find a committee with, say, a majority of pluralists. But it is true that the services of a number of individuals are greatly in demand, and that they serve on many committees. "Government advisory committees at national level" are in relation to the problem a very restricted set of committees, and a wider picture is really needed. Nor do these figures illustrate the repeated appointment of some persons. An individual may serve on only two committees at once but on ten in ten years. What is wrong about plurality, as it exists, is the appointment of some people too often, not that advisory committees consist mainly of people on other advisory committees, for this is not so.

What are the causes of the plurality that occurs? Advisory committees are, of course, recruited separately; no co-ordinated operation for appointing them takes place. Even within a department, when a particular committee is being chosen, Ministers and civil servants are not normally disposed to regard the presence of an individual on some other committee as a bar to his recruitment—why, indeed, should it be any handicap?

There are more positive reasons. It has been shown that many independent organisations nominate the same persons repeatedly. This is a matter of organisation policy: for reasons of internal co-ordination and convenience they wish to concentrate the work in a particular direction in a few hands. They appoint the same one or two persons to related committees, thus removing the need for co-ordinating arrangements between different representatives and lessening the risk of taking different attitudes in different places. A similar device may sometimes be adopted by the Government—a member of the Advisory Council on Scientific Policy was appointed to the Ministry of Supply's Advisory Council on Scientific Research, and another was chairman of the Defence Research Policy Committee. Members of the Colonial Research Council

committees without MPs belong, so far as can be judged, to a second category: committees where no MPs serve at present, but where there is no rule or definite convention against their appointment. If developments led to an MP being put forward then he might be appointed to committees such as these. The National Production Advisory Council on Industry is in this situation and so are many committees at the Board of Trade, such as the Engineering Advisory Council and the National Advisory Council for the Motor Manufacturing Industry. At other ministries the Central Advisory Water Committee and the Advisory Council on Child Care provide further examples. Appointment of MPs can vary with the views of succeeding Ministers—some have appointed Members to the Central Housing Advisory Committee, and others have avoided doing so.

Thirdly, there are advisory committees on which Members do serve, by virtue of some non-political qualification or experience. On the Central Health Services Council two Members serve, one as a person with experience of local government and the other as a pharmacist. In 1958, a trade unionist MP (Sir Tom O'Brien) was a member of the National Joint Advisory Council at the Ministry of Labour, and also on the Cinematograph Films Council. A Conservative MP, Mr. J. Grimston, was on the Non-ferrous Metals Consultative Committee.

Fourthly, it can be deliberate policy to appoint Members of Parliament to advisory committees. This is the practice with the Advisory Panel on the Highlands and Islands of Scotland.

The advantage to the committees of having MPs as such is that they are brought into touch with the political world, on which their advice may have some impact. A committee may get a foretaste, for example, of what the process of legislation on its subject will be like—of what the various parties will welcome, what they will resist, and what they will swallow. If the real purpose of the committee is to launch a new policy on the country, then MPs will contribute much to this end. There may be advantages to MPs and Parliament as well as to the committee. Lord Morrison of Lambeth has written:

It is wise in the appointment of all committees to consider the inclusion of MPs for this gives them valuable experience and ensures well-informed contributions to parliamentary debate.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> H. Morrison, *Government and Parliament* (Oxford), 1954, p. 275.

opinions. First-hand experience is usually more valuable to a committee than polished presentation. Moreover, there is a good deal to be said for avoiding even the appearance of a restricted group of appointees, and this applies to the nominees of organisations as well as to those privately recruited. It is important that advisory committees should command both general confidence and the particular confidence of the interests concerned, and one way to do this is to spread participation as far as possible.

All in all, it cannot be said that plurality is rampant or a scandal, or anything of that sort. But it could be less; and probably it could be less without damage to smooth and effective work by advisory committees. If some method could be devised, within departments and between departments, to limit duplication to those cases with some reasonable purpose, then confidence would be increased and the work of committees perhaps improved. At all events any tendency towards isolation and exclusiveness of advisory committees would be discouraged; and this is much more important than the actual plurality of service by a few individuals.

#### MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Should backbench Members of the House of Commons become members of advisory committees? The question is important for advisory bodies themselves—will their effectiveness be enhanced by the participation of party politicians?—but it is also of consequence for the political system generally. Does it affect Parliament or the party system, for instance, if MPs contribute in this way to the work of government?

There appear to be four possible practices in this respect, and examples can be found of all of them. First, there is permanent exclusion. The House of Commons Disqualification Act, 1957, prohibits members of various bodies from sitting in the Commons, and members of a few advisory committees, where payment is made, are among those excluded.<sup>7</sup>

This is, however, a very small category. Most of the advisory

<sup>7</sup> See House of Commons Disqualification Act, 1957, First Schedule. All members of the following advisory committees are disqualified: Air Transport Advisory Council; Development Commission; Industrial Injuries Advisory Council; Monopolies Commission; National Insurance Advisory Committee; University Grants Committee, and the White Fish Advisory Council. The Chairman of the Cinematograph Films Council and the Chairman of the Technical Personnel Committee at the Ministry of Labour are also disqualified.

## CHAPTER 4

### METHODS OF WORK

THIS chapter is concerned not so much with what advisory committees do as with the way they do it. The aspects to be discussed are those where the methods are thought to show something significant about the nature or the effectiveness of the committees. It has not been possible, of course, to make any detailed study of actual proceedings, which are confidential, but only to generalise from known facts.

The methods of work of committees vary considerably, as does their composition. The Haldane Report, urging departments to use advisory committees, had this to say about their organisation:

The precise form of organisation suitable to an advisory body or bodies will always depend in the main upon the nature of the business of the Department to which they are attached. Different methods of constituting such bodies and calling them into consultation will be required according to the object they are intended to pursue, which may be the development of the service rendered by a profession to the community, the advancement of knowledge in relation to a particular service, or the maintenance and improvement of the conditions of employment of persons engaged in that service.<sup>1</sup>

First, the chapter will discuss the influence of basic structure—terms of reference, constitution, etc.—on the methods employed by committees. Secondly, the different ways of making progress are described: meetings and discussion, research, delegation to sub-committees and so on. Thirdly, the results of committee activity, the volume and direction of effect, the type of topic dealt with by advisory committees, and the nature of reports and recommendations are considered.

#### STRUCTURE AND METHODS

An advisory committee is a body with a purpose and a constitution, and to a considerable extent these are prescribed for it. This section examines the part played by some basic conditions in limiting or prompting the methods to be used by the committee.

<sup>1</sup> Report of the Machinery of Government Committee, 1918, Cmd. 9230, p. 12, para. 36.

There may well be difficulties in particular cases. A Member might receive confidential information on the committee which was an embarrassment to him in the House. If Ministers were on the committee, they might be inhibited from speaking frankly about their intentions before Opposition MPs. Certainly the appointment of MPs who were not particularly well qualified to advisory bodies would be no service either to a committee or to Parliament. Some MPs feel that they cannot be loyal members of an advisory committee and at the same time exercise their full freedom of political action. They suspect that appointment to a committee is a device to restrain them from public criticism in the House.

Members of the House of Lords are sometimes appointed to advisory committees. Though many of them have recognised political affiliations, these do not seem to have any significant effect, or to cause any difficulties. Perhaps members of the peerage give prestige to a committee. Perhaps those who serve may make better speeches in the Lords, as MPs may make better speeches in the Commons. But so far as advisory committees are concerned, membership of the House of Lords has less significance, either for or against, than has membership of the Commons.

This question of MPs and peers, however, illustrates again the importance of the links which advisory committees have with the community quite apart from the department they are serving. Unlike most other committees and arrangements within the Government machine, advisory committees have a publicly-announced existence, and some publish reports on their work. They engage the attention of the nation's most powerful organisations and some of its leading intellects. In Chapter Five their functions and influence are considered; but it is evident from the logic of their composition alone that it is their place not merely as official counsellors of Ministers and departments, but in the system of British democracy as a whole that needs to be assessed.



and report on draft regulations, and (ii) to consider and advise on such questions as the Minister refers to it. In this case the Committee is not given any general initiative, nor is it free to act on its own account to consider the working of the insurance scheme in general. The terms of reference of the statutory Air Transport Advisory Council, themselves comprising six sub-sections of the Act, are made more specific by two directives issued to the Council on 26 January 1949 and 26 September 1950. These directives lay down the principles of Government policy to which the Council is expected to adhere in making its recommendations to the Minister on applications by Charter Companies for approval of proposed scheduled services.

In contrast to this, the statutory Central Housing Advisory Committee has detailed terms of reference but can also make "to the Minister, such representations with respect to matters of general concern arising in connection with the execution of these enactments as the Committee think desirable". The Central Advisory Water Committee has a similar power to make representations. Among the non-statutory committees, the Advisory Council on Scientific Policy is one with very broad terms of reference. These are: "to advise the Minister for Science in the exercise of his responsibility in the formulation and execution of Government scientific policy."

Although most committees have fairly specific, and indeed occasionally detailed, terms of reference, often there is included a general phrase, such as the Housing Committee has. The terms of reference, therefore, are not usually a restricting factor. They are intended as much as anything to divide the field where there are several committees which might get in each other's way, or where committees' activities could trespass upon the work of other institutions. Thus, industrial consultative committees are debarred from considering wage negotiations. Where a committee particularly wishes to discuss or pronounce upon a subject, it usually manages to get round any limitations in its terms of reference. When Sir Geoffrey Crowther, chairman of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England), wrote a letter to the Minister of Education drawing his attention to the shortage of teachers, he avoided dealing with a topic reserved for the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers, by talking about the *demand* for teachers. Again, where committees have not been

*Terms of reference*

The work of a committee is usually set out in the terms of reference. In addition, a framework within which the work is to be done is established by rules of procedure, by regulations about meetings, and so on. Sometimes the instrument setting up the committee and defining its terms of reference includes procedural provisions as well. The terms of reference vary greatly in origin. Sometimes they are to be found in a statute, sometimes in a statutory order, sometimes in an order of the Minister. Some, indeed, are hardly set down at all.

The committees with their terms of reference set down in a statute are frequently those concerned with social services, but one of the earliest of such committees was the Advisory Committee set up in 1913 under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act of 1876. From the inter-war period there are two notable examples: the Central Advisory Committee on War Pensions, and the Unemployment Insurance Statutory Committee, which was in some respect the predecessor of the National Insurance Advisory Committee. Among post-war examples are the Advisory Council on Child Care and the National Advisory Council on the Employment of the Disabled.

Some of the most important committees have been set up on Ministerial initiative—for example, the National Production Advisory Council on Industry, the National Joint Advisory Council of the Ministry of Labour, the Engineering Advisory Council and the Advisory Council on the Treatment of Offenders. Many of the committees in this category are primarily consultative in purpose—a forum for the exchange of views between the Government and interested groups. A committee which is informal not only in its composition, but also in its form and procedure is the Consultative Committee for Industry at the Board of Trade. This committee has no formal terms of reference any more than it has formal rules for membership, and it is interested only in discussing overseas trade.

Besides these differences of origin there are other differences: for instance, the terms of reference may be limited and specific, or they may be general, giving the committee a wide area of activity and initiative in proposing subjects for discussion.

The terms of reference of the statutory National Insurance Advisory Committee are quite specific. They are (i) to consider

mentioned in Chapter Three, the National Health Service Act of 1946, in the First Schedule, paragraph 1, provides that six persons shall be members of the Central Health Services Council *ex officio* (these are chiefly the Presidents of the Royal Colleges and the Chairman of BMA); and in addition, that the remaining thirty-five members should be chosen from among eight groups, in specified proportions. The Council for Wales and Monmouthshire is required to meet at least quarterly. The National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers is required to work through three committees; the membership of this Council is also laid down in great detail; the committees are to deal with training and qualifications, supply and distribution, and teachers in establishments of further education. Some committees are required, according to the terms given them, to report to the Minister, or to make periodical reports: for example, the Advisory Council on Scientific Research and Technical Development. More frequently these are matters provided for by statutory instruments or other less formal methods. Where a committee is set up under statute, there is usually provision for the payment of expenses but not of fees.

### *The chairman*

When the chairman is a civil servant, he is likely to be in charge of a section of the department responsible for the subject which the committee is considering. In these circumstances, from the department's point of view, it is difficult for the committee to go wrong; but even under these conditions, the committee is almost always something more than a creature of the department. It can give the department expert information and it can assist the department in drawing up regulations which will be acceptable to those affected. At the most important committees where the Minister or the Parliamentary Secretary is in the chair, the position is not really dissimilar.

Where there is a chairman from outside the Ministry, more depends upon the secretary; but the secretary has the advantage that the committee work is part of his regular job, and the subject with which the committee deals is part of his day-to-day work. The chairman has a higher status than that of the ordinary members of the committee. Not only is he responsible for the conduct of the meeting, but he may be consulted in urgent cases in be-

given a general right of initiative, they may persuade the Ministers to refer to them questions which they wish to discuss. There seem to be some committees where these subterfuges are superfluous: they have to be prompted to discuss anything at all.

The real function of a committee is sometimes very different from its original terms of reference, and sometimes changes over a period of time. For example, the Economic Planning Board, according to its terms of reference, had as its primary aim "to advise H.M. Government on the best use of our economic resources both toward the realisation of a long term plan and remedial measures against our immediate difficulties", but nowadays the function of the Board is described by expressions like "reviewing general economic problems". Again the Central Advisory Council for Education (England) is supposed "to advise the Minister upon such matters connected with education theory and practice as they think fit". In the debate in the House of Commons, Mr. Butler, the Minister of Education, amplified this:

Our object then is quite definite; it is for once to attach to the central authority in England a body which can pay some attention to what is taught in the schools, and also pay attention to all the most modern and up-to-date methods and, by reviewing the position continually, consider the question of what may be taught to the children.\*

In fact, that Council's work is largely different from Mr. Butler's expressed intentions—necessarily so, because it is not the province of the central government and, consequently, of a committee advising it, to determine school curricula. In the main the Council does research and sometimes detailed research on educational problems. A third example, the Television Advisory Committee is "to advise the P.M.G. on the development of television and sound broadcasting at frequencies above 30 megacycles, and related matters including competitive television services and television for public showing in cinemas or elsewhere." The Committee has not considered competitive television because it is too explosive and too political a question to be dealt with by an advisory committee, and the likelihood of television for public showing in cinemas and elsewhere has disappeared.

Sometimes the instruments creating committees lay down precise details about membership, meetings, or methods of work. As

\* *Hansard*, Col. 1707, 8 February 1944.

tween meetings; more often perhaps, the chairman and two or three leading members are consulted.

### *The secretariat*

Secretarial services are usually provided by the Ministry. This means keeping the minutes, circulating the agenda, arranging for payment of expenses, etc. It is seldom a full-time job. Normally, the secretary spends only three or four days on committee work between meetings, though the Central Advisory Council for Education (England) has had, for its work on 15-18 years olds, a full-time secretary. The secretary should regard himself as the servant of the committee and as the interpreter of the department to the committee and of the committee to the department, rather than as the servant of the department. To serve this function, the secretary must be able to put into the minutes the views that members want to be recorded as having expressed without departing too far from what was said. It is also the duty of the secretary to brief the chairman. A Treasury instructional booklet gives the following advice:

The amount of briefing which the Chairman needs will depend upon circumstances. Sometimes the Secretary need do no more than pass on any relevant information, e.g. that certain members will not be present; sometimes the Chairman will need a brief which will summarise the main points he should make and help him in planning the meeting. It may usefully include notes about the views particular members are likely to express. Such a brief is almost invariably supplied if the Chairman is a Minister.\*

Here a cynic might see the iron hand of the department in the velvet glove of the secretary of the committee.

The secretariat of the NPACI is, as a matter of administrative convenience, provided by the Board of Trade. The Minister taking the chair is the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the secretariat and the Council are responsible to him. The Economic Planning Board has a joint secretariat provided by the Treasury and the Cabinet Office. Where a committee is dealing with technical subjects either itself or by its sub-committees, it is frequently provided with technical secretaries. The Central Health Service Council and its committees however do not have technical secretaries; the secretaries from the administrative class find that they

\* See "Committee Procedure", in *Public Administration*, Autumn 1958, p. 251.

functions. There may well be a difference of atmosphere at the meetings of small committees compared with those of large ones. But this is not a distinctive feature of advisory committees: similar differences occur in other groups of varying size. Nor can a correlation between the size of an advisory committee and the proportion attending its meetings be easily established: some of the largest, such as the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers, seem to maintain their attendance just as well as smaller committees. The practice of working through sub-committees or other associated bodies is discussed later in this chapter. But again it arises far more from the purpose of the advisory committee than from its size—the NPACI, a large consultative committee, has only an interim committee and does not need sub-committees. The Colonial Research Council, a relatively small body, worked in direct association with twenty-six Colonial Research Committees and sub-committees, and the Agricultural Improvement Council has nearly as many.

### MAKING PROGRESS

It is implicit in the nature of a committee that it meets and discusses and this section begins by examining these fundamental procedures. But other means of achieving the purposes of advisory committees are also employed—visits, research, delegation to sub-committees—and progress is also helped if there is co-ordination with similar committees. All these ways of going about committee business are conducted with some degree of privacy, and the section includes a note on the confidential nature of proceedings.

#### *Meetings and visits*

Where there are rules governing a committee, whether statutory or not, specifying how many meetings are required, this is a minimum requirement and extra meetings are possible if desired. The most common practice is to meet quarterly. This is the case with the National Production Advisory Council on Industry, the National Joint Advisory Council and, for example, the Poultry (Stock Improvement) Advisory Committee. Some committees meet less frequently,<sup>4</sup> for example, the Advisory Committee on the Provincial Agricultural Economics Service usually meets in

<sup>4</sup> Indeed, a few committees are inactive and have not met for years.

The rank of the secretary sometimes gives an indication both of the importance of the chairman and of the generality of the work of the committee. In the case of the NPACI, where the Chancellor of the Exchequer is the chairman, the secretary is an Under Secretary, whereas the Oil and Fats Advisory Panel, which has an Assistant Secretary as chairman, has an Executive Officer as secretary. But there is no fixed rule, and one major committee (the National Joint Advisory Council) has an Assistant Principal as secretary.

Committees are usually given papers to study even when the function of the committee is primarily consultative. These papers are almost invariably written by civil servants. There is no reason why papers should not be written by the members of committees but, in fact, they seldom are, probably because members are too busy, but possibly also because they feel that the matter is not sufficiently important and that they are not sufficiently knowledgeable to commit themselves to writing. The papers are not always written in the department which sponsors the committee; in a number of cases, papers are supplied by other departments. For example, for the Engineering Advisory Council and for the National Advisory Council for the Motor Manufacturing Industry, papers have sometimes been written in the Ministry of Supply. At the NPACI the Chancellor's statement is prepared in the Treasury, not by the Council secretariat. There are, of course, some occasions when members of committees have written and presented papers. In addition the regional reports to the NPACI are prepared by the chairmen of the Regional Boards for Industry. It appears that on the consultative committees the trade unionists are slightly more willing to produce papers than the employers. Among the committees concerned with social services, papers have been produced by members of the Central Health Services Council and by members of the Advisory Council on the Treatment of Offenders.

### *The effects of size*

It is frequently said that the size of a committee affects its methods of work. In practice this sort of correlation is very difficult to trace. The factors determining the methods of work are first, the functions of the committee, and secondly, the type of membership of the committee, itself a consequence of the

draft regulations; on proposed regulations, legislation, negotiations and so on; or on topics briefly indicated by the agenda, depending on the function of the committee. This is the subject-matter with which the committee has to deal. The meeting is usually informal in its conduct. The National Production Advisory Council on Industry is perhaps the most formal of all. There is a top table at which the Ministers and, occasionally, senior civil servants sit; on one side are the employers and the Iron and Steel Board and on the other side the TUC and the nationalised industries. Most civil servants sit with the members. On the other hand, there is the Economic Planning Board, which is informal in its procedure. Although most committees are bigger than this, members very often know each other personally and are on Christian-name terms. Trade unionists tend to prefer Christian names to surnames without titles as the latter savour of master and man relationships.

The direction of the discussion varies more with the type of committee than with anything else. In the negotiating committees, such as the Police Council for Great Britain or the Burnham Committees, the discussion usually goes across the table between the two sides. If there is a deadlock, the chairman may be able to bring about a compromise, but this happens outside committee meetings.

On the consultative committees, on the other hand, it is more common for the discussion to flow between the Government and the other members. The NPACI and the National Joint Advisory Council tend, indeed, to be set pieces. The real substance of the NPACI is the Chancellor's statement, which is followed by a brief discussion. Further contributions are made by the chairmen of Regional Boards for Industry. Members of the Council are kept closely but discreetly to the point. At the NJAC there is generally one spokesman for each group. Thus, Sir John Benstead, the Vice-Chairman of the British Transport Commission, usually leads for all the nationalised industries. The President of the British Employers' Confederation leads for the employers and the chairman of the appropriate committee leads for the TUC. In this way the various groups are able to maintain a united front. The Government side also seeks to maintain a united front, masking interdepartmental differences behind silence. This does not mean, however, that on these two committees the trade unions and the



the autumn, but sometimes also in the spring; and the Colonial Advisory Medical Committee meets only twice a year. A fairly numerous category is that of committees which meet more often than quarterly. Among them is the Standing Advisory Committee on Carriage of Dangerous Goods and Explosives in Ships, which meets every four to five weeks. This is, however, a small committee. The Central Advisory Council for Education (England), with thirty-one members, met monthly. This was the more surprising as it had three sub-committees to do the basic work. Other committees meet from four to eight times a year, according to the amount of business to be transacted. There remains another category of committees which meet irregularly. One of these is the National Insurance Advisory Committee, the frequency of whose meetings is governed by the extent of the draft regulations submitted to it and the nature and number of questions it is asked to consider. On the whole it has met frequently, and there have been periods when it has met at monthly intervals for up to two days for each meeting. The Police Council for Great Britain and the Burnham Committees both meet irregularly. When there is a claim about pay or conditions to be decided their meetings are frequent and afterwards they lapse into inactivity until the next claim.

Some committees visit establishments which are of interest to them in order to collect information necessary for their work. The Advisory Council on Scientific Research and Technical Development usually arranges for two of its seven or eight annual meetings to be held at research establishments, so as to see the progress of work on the spot, and its subsidiary bodies make frequent visits to the establishments with which they are concerned. The Agricultural Improvement Council, though it normally meets in London, has visited experimental farms and horticultural stations and its members participate in visits paid to those centres by its committees. The members of the Advisory Council on the Treatment of Offenders visit prisons and other institutions. The Council for Wales and Monmouthshire and, in particular, its committees, have met in different parts of Wales.

#### *Discussion in committees*

Discussion at committee meetings is based on papers prepared for the purpose; on papers or reports from sub-committees; on

technical colleges it conducted a survey into progress through technical college courses. An example of a committee sponsoring a great deal of research is the Colonial Research Council and its associated committees, but none of these committees do research directly themselves. Research on agriculture is divided between the Agricultural Research Council under the aegis of the Privy Council and the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. Whereas the Agricultural Research Council tends to concentrate on pure research, that done by the Ministry tends to be more "applied" and closely tied to immediate needs. Another technique is to call for evidence on the basis of some precise document. For example, the National Insurance Advisory Committee publishes draft regulations and calls for representations on them. These representations are required to be in writing in the first instance but the Committee may invite oral evidence thereafter. The Industrial Injuries Advisory Council works in the same way.

Other committees, such as the Central Housing Advisory Committee, may call for evidence on a more general topic. In some cases, this method of work is no more than copying information that is already available in other sources; this has a value of its own, but can hardly be dignified by the name of research. In other cases the work of the Committee has been more substantial in content. In its report on "Unsatisfactory Tenants",<sup>5</sup> the Housing Management Sub-committee invited evidence by questionnaire from 101 local authorities and sought the views of the local authority associations and of a number of other organisations. A similar procedure was followed for the report on "Transfers, Exchanges and Rents".<sup>6</sup> These two reports, by showing how some councils had worked out systems for allowing rent rebates, for example, encouraged others to attempt the same thing.

This is not the only committee to wish to collect information from a particular group. The sub-committee on the demand for water of the Central Advisory Water Committee asked the Ministry of Housing and Local Government to send out a questionnaire for information on the growth of demand. The questionnaire was actually sent out by the British Waterworks Association as a matter of convenience.

<sup>5</sup> HMSO, 1955.

<sup>6</sup> HMSO, 1953.

employers are always against each other. At the NJAC the trade unionists and the employers have been united in pressing the Government to deal with the problem of the shortage of scientists.

The Consultative Committee for Industry is much more informal than either the NPACI or the NJAC. Again, the discussion flows between the Government on the one hand, and the employers and the unions on the other, because the real question at issue is the attitudes of industry to the policy the Government is pursuing whether in its negotiations for a free trade area or in negotiations concerning the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and there is no reason why employers and unions should hold differing views; but even where employers and unions are in disagreement, they still talk to the Government more than they argue with each other. On these and other industrial committees, such as the Engineering Advisory Council or the Machine Tool Advisory Council, questions concerning wages and conditions of service are outside the terms of reference, and therefore the main topic between employers and trade unions is excluded, making direct conflict less common than might be supposed.

There is yet another type of discussion which one might call "round the table" discussion, where members speak as individuals and no attempt is made to maintain fronts. This type of discussion is common on the social service committees or the expert committees, rather than the consultative committees; a characteristic example would be the Advisory Council on Child Care, or the Lord Chancellor's Committee set up under the Legal Aid and Advice Act. Even with this type of discussion Government representatives do not bring interdepartmental differences into the open, but try to settle them through other machinery.

#### *Research sponsored by committees*

Research, either in the sense of looking something up, or in the more fundamental sense of finding out something new, is a necessary part of the work of many committees, and there are varying ways by which this is carried out. What one might call research proper is occasionally initiated by committees. Thus the Central Advisory Council for Education (England) has made use of the Social Survey to conduct a survey of 15-18 year olds; with the co-operation of the Service departments it carried out a survey of young men joining for National Service; and through the

trade negotiations. The production review committee works with a technical (engineer) secretary and, with the aid of co-opted representatives of the main users of machine tools, seeks to identify and suggest measures for filling gaps in British machine tool production.

On rare occasions advisory committees use interim committees. The NPACI has one which can be called in an emergency and which can also deal with detailed matters referred to it by the Council. It is a smaller body than the Council itself; the same organisations send fewer representatives. The National Joint Advisory Council uses the Joint Consultative Committee in the same way. It is a Committee of seven members from the BEC, seven from the TUC, and two from the nationalised industries, making a total of sixteen, whereas the Council as a whole has some forty members. The Joint Consultative Committee acts as a clearing-house for business too detailed for the Council, and reports on its work to the Council.

Some committees have no sub-committees at all, for example, the Advisory Council on Child Care. Some have a few sub-committees, two or three—three in fact seems to be a very popular number. Others have a great many, for example, the Advisory Council on Scientific Research and Technical Development has five boards, each with their own committees, sub-committees, and groups, and the Agricultural Improvement Council has some twenty-three committees, sub-committees, groups and working parties. In both these cases, the Council is responsible for a wide range of subjects requiring detailed, expert advice. These sub-committees are almost invariably smaller than the parent body, as might be expected, and frequently have no more than about twelve members. There is almost always power of co-option, and almost invariably some members of the sub-committee are also members of the parent body. Again, as might be expected, meetings of sub-committees are usually more frequent than those of the parent body. Typically the sub-committee meets several times and then reports back. But the Advisory Council on Scientific Research and Technical Development meets seven or eight times a year, more frequently than many of its boards and committees, which meet only four or five times a year.

Almost invariably the sub-committees prepare reports for their parent bodies to consider, but the Advisory Council on Scientific

*Sub-committees*

Much work is done through sub-committees. Sometimes this causes delay; thus the Minister might refer a question to a committee for advice and the committee would consider itself unable to give this advice until its own sub-committees had investigated the question and reported back: obviously a slow process. In other circumstances a sub-committee, being small and able to meet more often, may make for speed. In many cases there is a real desire for information which can be obtained more conveniently by a sub-committee than by the committee proper. Some sub-committees are statutory. For example, the urban and rural sub-committees of the Scottish Housing Advisory Committee, and the Standing Committees of the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers. In the case of the Teachers Council, the standing committees are lively and find plenty to do.

Sub-committees are used to deal with work that is too technical or specialised for the main committee. Some of the subordinate bodies of the Agricultural Improvement Council are groups concentrating on such narrow topics as hops, taint, and horticultural buildings. The Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies has delegated some of its work to two territorial and a technical sub-committee and also used *ad hoc* sub-committees when required.

When a committee wants a detailed study of a particular topic it usually appoints an *ad hoc* sub-committee. The Central Health Services Council has appointed many such committees to deal with topics such as the reception and welfare of in-patients, and co-operation between hospital, general practitioner and local authority services. This is the technique most often used by the Central Housing Advisory Committee which usually has one or two committees working on its reports. The National Joint Advisory Council has used an *ad hoc* sub-committee, namely the Carr Committee, to report on apprenticeship schemes; and there are several other examples.

The Machine Tool Advisory Council seems to be the only one of the engineering consultative committees to use this device—it has two lively sub-committees. The trade members of the exports sub-committee concern themselves generally with detailed questions about exports of machine tools, and in particular seek to influence the advice civil servants will tender about forthcoming

trade negotiations. The production review committee works with a technical (engineer) secretary and, with the aid of co-opted representatives of the main users of machine tools, seeks to identify and suggest measures for filling gaps in British machine tool production.

On rare occasions advisory committees use interim committees. The NPACI has one which can be called in an emergency and which can also deal with detailed matters referred to it by the Council. It is a smaller body than the Council itself; the same organisations send fewer representatives. The National Joint Advisory Council uses the Joint Consultative Committee in the same way. It is a Committee of seven members from the BEC, seven from the TUC, and two from the nationalised industries, making a total of sixteen, whereas the Council as a whole has some forty members. The Joint Consultative Committee acts as a clearing-house for business too detailed for the Council, and reports on its work to the Council.

Some committees have no sub-committees at all, for example, the Advisory Council on Child Care. Some have a few sub-committees, two or three—three in fact seems to be a very popular number. Others have a great many, for example, the Advisory Council on Scientific Research and Technical Development has five boards, each with their own committees, sub-committees, and groups, and the Agricultural Improvement Council has some twenty-three committees, sub-committees, groups and working parties. In both these cases, the Council is responsible for a wide range of subjects requiring detailed, expert advice. These sub-committees are almost invariably smaller than the parent body, as might be expected, and frequently have no more than about twelve members. There is almost always power of co-option, and almost invariably some members of the sub-committee are also members of the parent body. Again, as might be expected, meetings of sub-committees are usually more frequent than those of the parent body. Typically the sub-committee meets several times and then reports back. But the Advisory Council on Scientific Research and Technical Development meets seven or eight times a year, more frequently than many of its boards and committees, which meet only four or five times a year.

Almost invariably the sub-committees prepare reports for their parent bodies to consider, but the Advisory Council on Scientific

*Sub-committees*

Much work is done through sub-committees. Sometimes this causes delay; thus the Minister might refer a question to a committee for advice and the committee would consider itself unable to give this advice until its own sub-committees had investigated the question and reported back: obviously a slow process. In other circumstances a sub-committee, being small and able to meet more often, may make for speed. In many cases there is a real desire for information which can be obtained more conveniently by a sub-committee than by the committee proper. Some sub-committees are statutory. For example, the urban and rural sub-committees of the Scottish Housing Advisory Committee, and the Standing Committees of the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers. In the case of the Teachers Council, the standing committees are lively and find plenty to do.

Sub-committees are used to deal with work that is too technical or specialised for the main committee. Some of the subordinate bodies of the Agricultural Improvement Council are groups concentrating on such narrow topics as hops, taint, and horticultural buildings. The Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies has delegated some of its work to two territorial and a technical sub-committee and also used *ad hoc* sub-committees when required.

When a committee wants a detailed study of a particular topic it usually appoints an *ad hoc* sub-committee. The Central Health Services Council has appointed many such committees to deal with topics such as the reception and welfare of in-patients, and co-operation between hospital, general practitioner and local authority services. This is the technique most often used by the Central Housing Advisory Committee which usually has one or two committees working on its reports. The National Joint Advisory Council has used an *ad hoc* sub-committee, namely the Carr Committee, to report on apprenticeship schemes; and there are several other examples.

The Machine Tool Advisory Council seems to be the only one of the engineering consultative committees to use this device—it has two lively sub-committees. The trade members of the exports sub-committee concern themselves generally with detailed questions about exports of machine tools, and in particular seek to influence the advice civil servants will tender about forthcoming

should not discuss the subject matter with their colleagues in the various organisations. In fact, they are sometimes asked to do so, so that they can give a representative point of view at the committee meeting. It is, however, expected that members will not tell their colleagues exactly what was said at the committee meeting and who said it. There are some exceptions to this general rule. Sometimes secret papers are circulated and these must not be shown to, or even discussed with, anybody who is not a member. This applies particularly to some of the papers circulated to the Economic Planning Board; members may see some documents in draft before they are submitted to Ministers. It would therefore be a grave breach of confidence to show such papers to anyone whatsoever. The Advisory Council on Scientific Policy has occasionally discussed secret papers. The proceedings and activities of defence committees are plainly secret. An example is the Advisory Council on Scientific Research and Technical Development. The membership of its sub-committees and boards is not published at all because this would give an indication of the detailed subjects in which they were interested at any time and would therefore give a lead to the lines on which the most advanced defence thinking was proceeding.

## RESULTS

However hopefully they may be travelling, advisory committees are expected in some way to arrive at "advice", agreed or individual, written or oral. A general assessment of their influence on British government is given in Chapter Five; this section is concerned rather with the amount, objective, type and form of their products.

### *Volume of work*

The volume of work going before some committees fluctuates considerably. As a general rule, committees that are concerned with starting off a new service find themselves busiest during their first years of work. The Advisory Council on Child Care is no longer as busy as it was when the changes in the child care service brought about by the Children Act, 1948, were being introduced. Similarly, the National Insurance Advisory Committee had a particularly busy time at the inception of the National Insurance Scheme; since then the volume of its work has varied, as explained



Research and Technical Development is again an exception and tries as far as possible to make do, or to economise, by using the minutes of its subordinate bodies as the basis of an oral report by its Chairman.

Sometimes it is necessary to prevent the development of unofficial and undesired "sub-committees"—informal groups that come together by accident or habit. One suggested device is for all members of the committee to lunch together, so that those members who belong to the same Club do not conduct the committee's work from Pall Mall.

### *Liaison with other bodies*

Some committees make arrangements for liaison with other committees working in similar fields. Sometimes this takes the form of an exchange of papers. The Advisory Council on Child Care and the Central Advisory Water Committee send papers to the relevant departments in Scotland and thus co-ordination is possible with committees there concerned with similar problems. When the National Insurance Advisory Committee and the Industrial Injuries Advisory Council are working on allied problems they also exchange papers. In other cases, observers from other interested bodies or Governments are present. Thus there are two observers from Northern Ireland at the National Production Advisory Council on Industry, and on many committees of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food there are members from Northern Ireland and from the Department of Agriculture for Scotland. Sometimes this liaison is arranged informally by an over-lapping membership. Another arrangement is that of joint committees. One such committee is composed of members of the Agricultural Improvement Council for England and Wales, the Scottish Agricultural Improvement Council, and the Agricultural Research Council. Some of the committees of the Central Health Services Council are in fact joint committees drawing members from the English Council and from the Scottish Council.

### *Confidential nature of proceedings*

The papers, minutes and agenda of advisory committees are considered to be confidential in the sense that they are not for publication and that they are not to be shown to those who are not members of the committee. This does not mean that members

*Direction of effort*

Advisory committees are not used only to advise the Government, as indicated at the beginning of Chapter Two. They may be used by the Government to enlighten other groups. It has been suggested in some quarters that this is a function of the NPACI. This is no doubt true, but it is not its only or its main function: it is a forum for discussion, and it enables the chairmen of the Regional Boards for Industry to bring their problems directly to the attention of the Ministers and to feel, by being able to present their problems personally, that they are not being ignored as a result of not being in London. The Government may use committees to carry through a policy with other groups. The Police Council (not to be confused with the Police Council for Great Britain) was set up, by statute, primarily with the purpose of carrying through a policy of unifying police conditions and raising general standards throughout the country. At that time the initiative came from the Home Office rather than from any other interested group.

When a committee seeks to persuade (rather than exists to be persuaded) it may direct its efforts in any of several different directions. Advisory committees that are really concerned with administration or negotiation are not in this position, because their prime purpose is to perform a definite function or to bring about agreement, and their recommendations tend to be far more binding than any proposals put forward by consultative or even expert committees.

An advisory committee may concentrate its efforts on the Minister, or Ministers if several are involved. The NPACI, which has just been mentioned, is an example of this. The Consultative Committee for Industry in effect keeps the Minister informed of industrial reactions, to negotiations on international trade, whether in GATT, in connection with the negotiations for free trade in Europe, or other matters.

A committee may however direct its main attention to civil servants, and here the Economic Planning Board is perhaps a good example. While the Board's views are conveyed to Ministers as necessary, its other main function is to provide a forum for the frank discussion of broad questions of policy between senior civil servants, industrialists and trade unionists. The statutory function of the Advisory Council on Child Care is to advise the Secretary

above. For example, its work tends to increase with amending legislation giving fresh regulation-making powers. The work of the negotiating committees comes in spurts too, being concentrated in the periods immediately following a pay claim. Another variation on this theme is played by the Political Honours Scrutiny Committee. "... Can the right hon. Gentleman tell us whether he has any evidence at all that this Committee has met and done its job of scrutinising and vetting during the last five years? ..." asked Mr. Emrys Hughes in July 1959. Mr. Macmillan stated that the Committee reported every time there was an honours list and that all the names were scrupulously sent to it. The last report he had received was in May 1959.<sup>1</sup>

The degree of activity of a committee may depend on the attitude towards it of the Minister or the Permanent Secretary of the department to which it is attached. Mr. Macmillan, while Minister of Housing and Local Government, dispensed with the Central Advisory Water Committee, although it is a statutory committee, from 1952 to 1955, for reasons of national economy. Since 1956 the Economic Planning Board has led an active life, meeting eight or nine times a year. The wishes of committee members are not always as effective. The TUC would like the NPACI to be a positive force in British industrial development; the basic idea seems to be that if more information were disseminated through the Council, it could lead industry in improving efficiency. The idea appears to presuppose that the Council, presumably by virtue of representing both sides of industry and the Government, would carry more weight in encouraging efficiency than the unaided exhortations of the Government, the force of competition or the facilities available through trade associations. Some changes in the Council's procedure to this end were made in November 1959.

The activity of committees may be affected by circumstances. The Merchandise Marks Standing Committee of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, set up under Section 2 of the Merchandise Marks Act of 1926, considers applications for an Order in Council for the country of origin to be indicated on imported foodstuffs. This Committee was appointed in 1927; it died, not surprisingly, during the war and was revived again in 1951. After June 1954 it did not meet again until it was resuscitated in 1959.

<sup>1</sup> *Hansard*, Col. 612, 2 July 1959.

of State but since the relevant civil servants attend its meetings the Council can have an immediate influence on the administrative process.

Some committees direct most of their activities at Parliament. Others, like the National Insurance Advisory Committee, while essentially concerned with advising the Minister, issue reports which are useful to Parliament and which Parliament may have provided should be laid before it: these reports are of great assistance to the Standing Committee on Statutory Instruments. The Advisory Committee at the Lord Chancellor's office, set up under the Legal Aid and Advice Act of 1949, reports on the working of the legal aid scheme and its reports are submitted to Parliament to assist Parliament in assessing the working of the scheme.

Occasionally a committee may hope its work will reach further and enlighten the public at large. An example of this is the Central Advisory Council for Education (England) which has issued reports on educational problems such as *Early Leaving* and *15 to 18* which are clearly intended for a wider public than a purely educational one. The Council on Prices, Productivity and Incomes is intended to enlighten interest groups and the general public as well as the Government.

Some committees limit themselves principally to getting points across to their own interests. The National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers has urged measures to increase the supply of science teachers, and it has urged universities to provide refresher courses for science teachers and also for teachers of other subjects. Many of the reports of the Central Housing Advisory Committee are directed more to local authorities with housing powers than to the public at large. Yet another possibility is that of committees seeking to instruct groups outside themselves, perhaps aiming at a particular group. Surely it is this type of audience which the Advisory Council on Scientific Policy hopes to reach with its work on scientific libraries and technical information and on overseas scientific relations.

In most cases, of course, committees direct their efforts primarily at the Government, whether in the form of Ministers or civil servants. It is rare for committees to try to reach the general public, though probably the most spectacular case of this—and perhaps the most spectacular advisory committee of all—is the Council for Wales and Monmouthshire. On many committees, no

Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers. However, the Food Standards Advisory Committee has published two or three reports on particular foodstuffs every year. The National Food Survey Committee in addition to publishing an annual report on domestic food consumption and expenditure, publishes more detailed studies from time to time. The National Joint Advisory Council has published three reports in the last four years. Some committees annually publish a review of their work, for example, the Advisory Council on Scientific Policy, the Oversea Migration Board, the Milk and Milk Products Technical Advisory Committee and the Reviewing Committee on Export of Works of Art. The National Advisory Council for the Motor Manufacturing Industry published an annual report for its first year of activity; it has never published since.

Some committees have a statutory right to publish reports and sometimes an obligation to do so. The reports of the Air Transport Advisory Council must be laid before both Houses of Parliament together with a statement by the Minister of any action he has taken in consequence of the Council's recommendation and, if he does not propose to follow its advice, why he is refusing it. The annual reports of the Central Health Services Council are also published by provision of the statute. The BMA, at least, was very anxious that the Council should have the right to publish in order to increase its effectiveness, or at least to make known to the public what it had recommended. The reports of some committees have always been published; although this is not required by statute, it has become a convention. One such committee is the Council for Wales and Monmouthshire, and it sent its reply to the Prime Minister's letter on the question of a Secretary of State for Wales, in the form of a report in the hope that this reply would therefore be published. An expurgated version has been published.<sup>\*</sup> While the Minister may be obliged by statute or convention to publish a report, he is not compelled to publish it either immediately after presentation or at any other specified time. A judicious timing of publication may lessen its impact. A report published in August, during a Parliamentary recess or while the Minister is away may be almost forgotten by the time an opportunity of discussing it presents itself. On the whole, the committees are satis-

<sup>\*</sup> Fourth Memorandum (*Government administration in Wales*) and the reply of the Prime Minister, January 1959, Cmd. 631.

the only committee in any way concerned with the pottery or porcelain industry; at the Home Office there is a committee to consider the protection of birds, but none to deal with fauna in general. Other committees may deal with detailed questions; the Economic Research Committee of the Colonial Research Council sponsored a study of "The Oil Palm Economy of the Ibibio Farmer"; the Colonial Social Science Research Council recommended that a grant should be made for the study of differences in visual perception among various ethnic groups in Malaya, and another resulting in a paper entitled "A Note on Tangu Dreams".<sup>1</sup> The committees obviously are not expert in these topics, but they do need to know these specialised fields well enough to have the knowledge to judge the capacities and qualifications of would-be research workers.

### *Reports and publicity*

All the bodies considered here are advisory, but the advice to the Minister is rendered in several different forms. In some cases it consists purely of what is said at meetings; no reports are prepared and the minutes are not very detailed. This is the case with, for example, the Consultative Committee for Industry, and the Advisory Committee on Social Development in the Colonies. The recommendations of the Advisory Council on Child Care are contained in its minutes.

There have, of course, been minority reports. The first and second reports of the Television Advisory Committee included a reservation and a minority report respectively, and the Central Advisory Housing Committee has also produced minority reports from time to time; for example, Miss Jennie Lee disagreed with the major recommendations on reconditioning rural areas in 1947. The Central Advisory Water Committee has also produced minority reports. Occasionally a committee will publish the evidence or some of the evidence on which it has based its report—the Central Housing Advisory Committee has done this.

Some committees submit reports which are secret and are never published, for example, the Advisory Council on Scientific Research and Technical Development. Other committees publish some of their reports but not others. Among these committees are the Television Advisory Committee, and the National Advisory

<sup>1</sup> *Colonial Research*, 1956-7, Cmd. 321, pp. 136, 266, 267.

## THE FUNCTIONS AND INFLUENCE OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

How can the national significance of advisory committees be assessed? There is clearly no way of actually measuring their impact on national policies; and in so far as they are genuinely "advisory" that impact must be indeterminate. The task of this chapter, therefore, must be to try to establish some landmarks where there can be no first-hand information, few firm facts and no way of knowing how controversies were resolved. Material presented earlier in the report will be used to draw general conclusions and wider issues raised by the growth of advisory committees will be discussed.

It is scarcely ever possible to say that a certain policy was originated by a committee. It is even less possible to say what opposition there might have been in a department or elsewhere to such a policy, or how any issues between committees and departments came to be settled. The sort of evidence on which an account must be built consists rather of the type of subject handled by committees; of the attention given to the committee's work and reports by other public bodies; and of the attention and trouble given to them by participants and others closely concerned. But judgements about the situation within specialised circles are not enough. It is also important to note whether decisions which are vital or nearly so for the groups interested in them are of wider moment. To reckon the importance of each advisory committee to its "clientele" is one thing; to sum up the position of advisory committees in the political system in general is another.

### COMMITTEES AND INFORMAL ADVICE

There is now a very great amount of direct contact between Government departments and outside bodies. There is also constant consultation, by Ministers and civil servants, of individuals who are able to help on particular issues. So far as industry and commerce are concerned the system of "production" or "sponsoring" departments continues, each branch of industry looking to a

fied with the publicity that these reports get. Many become the basis for discussion in Parliament and outside, and many are circulated to local authorities. Some are noticed in the general press and almost invariably they are noted in the specialised press.

Some advisory committees want publicity, and some find it desirable to give an account of themselves to a limited public. A press conference is held after the meeting of the National Production Advisory Council on Industry, by the Head of the Treasury Information Division, and the Chancellor's statement is issued. (This is an improvement on the previous system whereby a press statement to be issued after the meeting of the Council was circulated to members two or three days in advance of the meeting.) After meetings of the National Joint Advisory Council, a summary of the subjects discussed is issued. There is no press conference.

The Engineering Advisory Council issues a limited summary covering some of the topics discussed at the meetings, for the benefit of the unions and the employers' associations. This summary does not mention members by name, but refers to "trade union members" or an "employer member" who said such and such and so on. About 1,400 copies are circulated through the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions, and some 255 through the Federation of British Industries. The Machine Tool Trades Association, which makes up nearly half the membership of the Machine Tool Advisory Council, agrees with the Board of Trade a summary of proceedings at meetings before issuing it to its membership; and the trade journals of the motor industry reveal a knowledge of the proceedings of the National Advisory Council for the Motor Manufacturing Industry.

Of many other committees, little more is published than their membership and their terms of reference. Changes of membership on the Economic Planning Board, on the Advisory Council on Scientific Research and Technical Development and numerous other committees are published as they occur.

This chapter ends on the same note as Chapter Three: the relations of advisory committees not with the machinery of government itself, but with the political system and the wider world beyond the central administration. In the next chapter these issues are examined more directly.



Furthermore, by their existence committees can settle, temporarily at least, the question of who is to be consulted, or whose advice is to be considered. Finally, some consultative committees provide a ready means of wide consultation in emergencies—informal methods can give very rapid results but a readily summoned committee can provide an all-round balanced view at short notice.

The fourth advantage arises from the formality of committees. They provide definite opinions, often written reports. In any case, they are quotable. What a certain advisory committee said on a subject can be stated in official documents or possibly in Parliament and it counts as evidence. What two or three people have said in conversation with a civil servant or politician cannot be used in this way.

These advantages are real and in many cases have proved decisive but, so far as it is possible to speak in quantitative terms, informal contacts remain of great importance. Advisory committees rarely make a very heavy impact, for instance, on the actual day-to-day work of a department: they are more concerned with long-term considerations.

In some circumstances a preponderance of informal advice is necessary and permanent, for it is obviously suited to the great quantity of minor issues that arise constantly; and it is essential for many urgent matters where there is no ready-made committee. But it also serves well when the issue is narrow enough to concern only two parties—the Government and one outside organisation—or when the advice needed is specialised enough to be provided by one or two experts. Informal advice can be more confidential. It is not announced and thus its existence as well as its contents are kept private. Soundings about draft legislation or changes in Government policy can thus be made more discreetly by informal methods. Finally, informal contact is used for residual matters and for anything which will not wait for the next committee meeting—if advice is not readily available by established machinery then it must be sought by methods of direct contact. Advisory committees may be systematic and thorough, but (unless a wide and balanced group is required, as noted above) they are comparatively slow.

But the great amount of informal advice should not overshadow the vital position of formal advisory committees. Com-

particular department for its main contact with the Government machine, and *vice versa*. There are regular private meetings between some Ministers and outside advisers,<sup>1</sup> and *ad hoc* meetings take place constantly at all levels of the administration, whereby groups of outside experts are consulted on particular topics.

What is the relationship between advisory committees and this continuous process of informal consultation? In the first place, why are committees needed at all—would not informal methods suffice in all cases? Some of the motives which impel Ministers to the formation of committees have been set out at the beginning of Chapter Two. What advantages do formal committees have in fulfilling these purposes? As distinct from *ad hoc* arrangements, committees may be said to have four virtues: regularity, comprehensive personal contact, convenience, and formal commitment.

The first is less than absolute: not all committees meet frequently—some seem not to meet at all. But where there is pressure from some quarter, where the subject is alive, then the existence of a committee will enable that subject to be pursued systematically and deliberately. This is the background to many consultative committees—if they did not exist then no doubt some informal talks would occur, but no systematic consultation year in year out would necessarily take place.

Secondly, while a good deal of personal contact takes place informally, this does not ensure, as committees do, that all the major interests or points of view confront one another, as well as meet the Government's representatives. Apart from negotiating committees, the tradition is one of round-the-table discussion, with all elements taking part. This face-to-face principle of general confrontation—amounting almost at times to a showdown—cannot be achieved by piecemeal consultation or a series of separate discussions.

It is, thirdly, a matter of great convenience, if there are many interests and points of view, for compromises to be reached or a general consensus achieved by the outside elements themselves. Committees can minimise the necessary diplomatic to-and-fro by the Government without depriving a Minister of the last word.

<sup>1</sup> See Sir Frank Lee, *The Board of Trade*, Stamp Memorial Lecture, 1958 (Athlone Press).

different from ordinary *ad hoc* consultation, and the occasions when there is sufficient routine about the process to make it a distinct form of procedure are few.

### *Industrial consultative committees*

An interesting situation has arisen with regard to consultative committees dealing with industry. Apart from general bodies like the National Production Advisory Council on Industry and the Economic Planning Board, there are committees for a number of separate industries—engineering, motor manufacture, machine tools, instruments, and so on at the Board of Trade; civil aviation at the Ministry of Aviation, shipbuilding at the Ministry of Transport; and building and civil engineering at the Ministry of Works.

For many industries, however, there are no such consultative committees: they manage entirely by informal consultation. In some case public bodies like the Cotton Board or the Iron and Steel Board exist in the industry but these are not necessarily used as a means of communication and consultation. Examples of industries without *orthodox consultative committees* include pottery, glass, most of chemicals, plastics, soap, radio, clocks and watches, wool, jute, silk, linen, man-made fibres, hosiery, lace, clothing, food canning and manufacture, brewing and distilling. It is obvious that consultation through a committee is by no means a standard arrangement.

Why do some industries have advisory committees, and others not? Some industries have managed to avoid the sort of recurring problem that makes their establishment or continuance necessary. In some cases, like motor manufacture or machine tools, the industry is in the public eye (perhaps as a result of trade union activity), and the Board of Trade may feel a need to be particularly well informed about it. In other cases there may be no official enthusiasm for knowledge:

It is by no means easy to decide how best to organise these contacts with industry. What degree of knowledge ought we to try to maintain of, say, the plastics industry, of ceramics, of the paint industry, or jewellery—to take only a few random industries? Despite the help which we get from trade associations, if we try to cover the whole field in meticulous detail, to be able to produce any particulars at any time about any industry, we shall maintain a large staff doing little

mittees are not set up for trivial and ephemeral affairs; and though they by no means monopolise the most substantial subjects, there is a growing tendency for major problems of a continuing nature to acquire an advisory committee. The coverage is now considerable, especially in the social service field, and is growing. Committees are in fact often the means of making contacts which are used in later informal consultation.

Advisory committees also provide a focus of attention. Though recommendations and even whole reports are rejected, this cannot usually be done off-hand, without any show of consideration, even within a department. Advisory committees can expect, in general, to be treated seriously by administrators even if their proposals are disliked. Where there are published reports, there is the prospect of outside pressure or agitation. Recommendations rejected by the Government may be taken up by the Opposition—for instance the teacher training programme suggested by the National Advisory Council on the Supply and Training of Teachers in autumn 1958; and the recommendations of the Lord Chancellor's advisory committee on the Legal Aid and Advice Act on the income limits under which the Act applied.<sup>3</sup>

There are ways of arranging advice that are not *ad hoc* but do not involve a committee. At the Colonial Office a series of Advisers have been appointed, some full-time and some part-time, on such subjects as colonial medicine, agriculture, education, animal health, social welfare, labour and so on. These people become part of the departmental machine itself; this is a way of organising specialist advice within the administrative system rather than obtaining it from outside. Usually they work closely with advisory committees in their field. Other departments (e.g. Agriculture, Housing) have similar arrangements for scientific advisers and so on.

There is also the "panel" system. A panel in this usage is a sort of committee that never meets: it is really a list of individuals who are consulted on a particular topic. In fact, some bodies called panels do meet from time to time and are indistinguishable from committees. Panel members proper are consulted by circulating documents for comment, or by civil servants getting in touch with them one by one and taking their advice. This clearly is not very

<sup>3</sup> See *Hansard*, 24 February 1959.

## THE POSITION OF INTEREST GROUPS

Most advisory committees have some of their members nominated, at least indirectly, by one or more independent organisations; and, even where this is not so, the subject-matter makes the work of committees of great concern to many groups. It is therefore important to examine the attitudes of interest groups to this part of the machinery of government.

These attitudes are for the most part favourable. National organisations value advisory committees as a means of impressing the views of their leaders on the Government and on other groups, and as a way of ensuring that the interests of their members are not neglected in the preparation of policy. In general they accept the division between committees and informal consultation as it exists.

There are, of course, exceptions to these generalisations. A few organisations strongly prefer direct consultation. Local authority associations, such as the Association of Municipal Corporations and the County Councils Association, are conspicuous among these.<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless, they always co-operate if committees are set up, and may come to respect the work of particular committees. There may be strong opposition to the administrative structure of which an advisory committee is part—a group may want an executive committee or an independent body or some similar rearrangement. Other complaints include—where the Minister has effective choice of membership—dissatisfaction with those selected out of the names suggested. Sometimes (but not often) interest groups come to the conclusion that a particular committee is a waste of time, and suggest its abolition. The main impact of interest groups, however, is to preserve committees rather than abolish them. Their natural instinct, after all, must be to husband all possible means of influence, however insignificant.

What do interest groups want from committees—what is a good committee from their point of view? Certainly they do not calculate this very closely, and they are patriotic enough or prudent enough to serve wherever requested. So far as most committees are concerned they are influenced by three considerations: adequate weight for their interest; avoidance of final commitment

<sup>4</sup> See, for instance, an article in the *County Councils Gazette*, "The Cult of the Advisory Council", March 1959, p. 81.

but "to keep in touch"—not in itself rewarding or satisfactory work. I am inclined to think that actually we still try to do too much and that we could with advantage be more selective at any rate as far as day-to-day contacts are concerned.<sup>3</sup>

The desire for knowledge and contact may well be satisfied, on this reckoning, by occasional meetings: certainly standing committees are not required. Even where committees continue to exist they are sometimes inactive—the Paint Advisory Committee and the Rubber Consultative Committee, for example, have not met for some time, and the National Civil Aviation Council rarely meets now.

In fact, the industrial committees which continue to be most active are concerned in the main with the engineering sector of industry. They are now attached to the Engineering Industries Division of the Board of Trade; until 1955 they were with the Ministry of Supply. This suggests that departmental history or tradition has something to do with their survival.

Perhaps ultimately the root of the matter lies in whether an industry wants a committee or not. This depends on whether it wants the Government to keep its affairs constantly in mind; and it is most likely to want this if it hopes for some sort of help, or fears it might need help in the future. Of course the Government wants the committees too, but in general consultative committees flourish when industries feel that the more the Government knows about them the more likely it is to do something for them, or at least to refrain from harmful actions.

In general, though informal advice is profuse in quantity, and may be used for vital and urgent matters, the work of advisory committees covers a wide and relatively important part of the policy-making side of British government. Neither for industrial committees nor for committees in general is it possible to give a simple explanation why they exist for some subjects and not for others. The answer may be sought in terms of administrative convenience and of the need for wide personal contacts, and for systematic and persistent consideration of the subject: but explanations will usually apply only to particular committees or groups of committees, and not to the whole range.

<sup>3</sup> Sir Frank Lee, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

are not often concerned. Professional bodies, such as engineers or accountants, may provide experts on appropriate committees but they do not become involved on industrial committees; they do not serve as middle class trade unions. Nor are non-industrial unions outside the Trades Union Congress (such as the National Union of Teachers or the National and Local Government Officers' Association) involved with top-level committees like the NPACI or the National Joint Advisory Council. The Institute of Directors is not concerned with industrial committees. There is no attempt to represent the full range of economic interests on any committee: it is the manufacturing and service industries that are predominantly concerned.

Outside industry the interest groups are rather differently placed. There are no wide, general bodies, except the local authority associations—such as the County Councils Association and the Association of Municipal Corporations—which suggest names for advisory committees at the Home Office, the Ministry of Housing, the Ministry of Health, and the Ministry of Education. Suggestions for membership of the Central Health Services Council and other committees at the Ministry of Health come, of course, from the British Medical Association but another set of professional organisations—the Royal Colleges—are among the other bodies involved. The National Farmers' Unions, the Country Landowners Association and the agricultural workers' unions are the bodies most frequently consulted about membership of agricultural committees. In education there are two organisations of major importance, the Association of Education Committees and the National Union of Teachers, but nominations are also sought from other specialist bodies, as well as the local authority associations already mentioned.

The catalogue could be continued and is by no means exhaustive for the subjects mentioned. Very many organisations nominate for one or two advisory committees which are their special concern. What does the list show? The organisations are the well-known ones: that is why they are asked to suggest names, of course. But being represented on committees acts in turn as evidence of their status. Trade associations and other organisations often point out that they are "recognised by" the Government when recruiting new members. They are all interest groups, rather than opinion groups—they are based on the common interest or activity of

to what their nominees say, or what the committee agrees; and dislike of too many independent laymen and of any attempt to represent their "clientele" except through them. They do not expect their nominees to sacrifice their personal independence. If this happened widely on expert committees, then the groups would find later disagreement with the report or with consequent Ministerial action difficult. Given satisfactory composition, interest groups do not mind strong advisory committees. If an advisory committee is weak an interest group may find it an unnecessary intermediary: nominations are made, evidence is submitted, and full co-operation given, but even then its report is not decisive, and the interest group must continue direct pressure, propaganda and so on as before.

Ministers may contrive to have a choice of individuals for committees, but they are rarely in a position to pick and choose among interest groups. The organisations represented, or which nominate members, are therefore the ones to be expected. Top level representation of industrialists is shared between the Federation of British Industries, the Association of British Chambers of Commerce and the National Union of Manufacturers; but none of these are concerned with labour matters, which are the province of the British Employers' Confederation. The Trades Union Congress is the corresponding body on the employees' side for all subjects. These organisations are the ones, therefore, who send representatives, or make nominations for general economic, production, and labour committees. The committees within the scope of this report on which they acknowledge representation in their annual reports are listed in Special Study IV, but these do not necessarily include those where there is only private and informal nomination or suggestion of names.

These bodies are "peak" organisations with wide, general interests. Their member-organisations are the ones concerned with more specialised committees—thus the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions nominates to various Board of Trade committees, and similarly the relevant trade associations suggest those who serve on the industrialists' side. This two-tier structure of national organisations is not found in any of the other (non-industrial) fields with which advisory committees are concerned. On the whole, manufacturing is more involved than distribution, and bodies such as the National Chamber of Trade



then the civil service must do research on its own account. But if the advice is only occasionally needed, or if it inherently involves contact with the latest discoveries then an advisory committee is appropriate.

Frequently, the answer is a combination of the two methods. In 1939 it was found that the arrangements for scientific research at the War Office were inadequate. The Ministry of Supply managed to raise standards during the war and was helped in this by a system of committees and boards under the Advisory Council on Scientific Research, by which the most advanced scientific knowledge from the universities and elsewhere was channelled to the various research projects. But also there has been a marked improvement in the standards of the research establishments themselves, so that the need for the advisory committees to supply information to them has greatly diminished: they now provide stimulation and help rather than actual knowledge. The linked work of the Agricultural Research Council, the Agricultural Improvement Councils and the National Agricultural Advisory Service again illustrates the integration of advisory committees with the work of experts in the Government service.

For some part of the expert knowledge and technique necessary to modern government, then, departments rely on advisory committees, either to supplement their own professional staff or to instruct administrators on technical problems. Wherever a committee is adequate to meet the needs of departments, it is likely to be preferred since it is much cheaper, simpler, and probably easier to abolish if it is no longer necessary.

The political fact to be noted here is the increasing reliance of the Government on advanced scientific knowledge, and hence on the specialists who are able to provide it. The scientific community has not so far developed the unity and cohesion displayed by some trades and professions, nor do its political and social attitudes differ markedly from those of the rest of the country. If circumstances develop, however, when such differences become significant, then the power of the scientists will become politically important. In measuring that power their co-operation in the machinery of government must be considered; and those whose co-operation is necessary include not only scientific civil servants, but many members of technical and scientific advisory committees.

their members, not necessarily on agreed opinions. Being able to nominate to advisory committees is one of the advantages which the organised have over the unorganised; and if the organisation is strong it will have at its disposal able, well-informed representatives, it may have itself considered the subject-matter of the committee, and it will be able to follow up any recommendations which may be made from time to time. But perhaps the most striking observation is the contrast with the old-fashioned picture of a pressure-group striving by all means to get a hearing. For these accredited interest groups there is no hammering at the door of the Ministries: they are constantly being invited in, and have acquired the power which comes from being immensely useful.

#### THE POWER OF SPECIALISTS

It is misleading to discuss advisory committees entirely in terms of the operations of interest groups, though they have some concern with the majority of committees. There are some with which they have very little or nothing to do, and many others where their views are subordinate to the work of specialists. Most of these specialists are natural scientists, doctors, technologists and so on, but there are also lawyers, insurance experts, other professional men, and university teachers from various faculties.

Most of the advice from committees can be described as essentially supplementary in character—it is an addition to what civil servants concerned with the subject already know, or it offers a wider and deeper consideration of some aspect of their responsibilities. But in some cases committees are needed because ordinary civil servants are out of their depth; technical committees in administrative departments, for example. The growth of Government functions, and the need for them to keep pace with general technical progress, has made the supply of up-to-date knowledge to the Government machine an urgent necessity. There are two basic ways of meeting this requirement—by the employment of scientific and professional staff inside the civil service, or by organising the supply of knowledge from outside, probably through an advisory committee.

In most cases the method to be adopted will virtually decide itself. If a quantity of information is needed then a staff will have to be recruited, or again if the knowledge is not available outside,

also make it weak by neglecting to do these things; and statutory prescriptions can do little to protect it. A committee that is not wanted by a department will tend to be weak whatever its status.

Can a committee nevertheless press its views on a reluctant Minister? It has been urged that the publication of reports stating the committee's views may enable it to do so, for publication means that other organisations and public opinion generally can come out in open support. If this happens the Minister may at the least be forced to make a public defence of his rejection of the committee's advice and may have to do more. At present only a minority of committees publish reports, as explained in Chapter Four, although many of these do attract considerable attention—those of the Advisory Council on Scientific Policy, for instance. Those of the Council on Prices, Productivity and Incomes are intended specifically for public as well as governmental attention. Widespread interest does not necessarily lead to acceptance of reports by the Government, as the Council for Wales has discovered, but though publication of reports can rarely be decisive it is a power worth having, and may contribute significantly to the strength of a committee in certain situations. Many committees, including expert ones, do not provide reports at all, even confidential ones; and many have a number of civil servants on them whose committee status would have to be modified so that they did not have to sign reports to Ministers. Where practicable advisory committees should have the power to publish reports and should exercise it when they have it; but this power is not likely to produce an easy or very general means of increasing the effectiveness of committees. There are further arguments of a political character for publication of reports, but these are discussed later.

It is also sometimes argued that the power of initiative is the key to an advisory committee's strength, that it should be able to take up such topics (within its terms of reference) as it chooses and not merely those referred to it by a Minister. This is clearly an advantage, and especially so if coupled with the publication of reports. But its indiscriminate use will do a committee more harm than good: departments are not likely to be enthusiastic about advice on subjects they do not want to hear about. Important committees which have this power include the Economic Planning Board, the Central Housing Advisory Committee, the Central Advisory

## THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Some generalisations about the impact of advisory committees may now be attempted. In assessing their importance and the factors which enhance it, both internal and external effectiveness<sup>1</sup> must be borne in mind—whether the committee members work together efficiently and well, and the influence which their work has on public affairs. First, some devices of general application will be considered; secondly, the impact of different types of committees will be described; and, thirdly, the place of advisory committees in various fields will be assessed.

*General considerations*

There are a number of well-known devices which are used to make advisory committees more effective. Some of these which concern the composition of the committees are dealt with in Chapter Three. The force of none of them is sufficient by itself to transform a feeble committee into one with great strength; nonetheless, the difference they make is on occasions significant, and they are not to be despised either taken together or singly.

In Chapter Two it was explained that a minority of advisory committees have a statutory basis. Their existence has therefore a degree of security: they do not depend for it on the approval of a Minister. Does this security give them added power and influence? On the whole, this is not so: statutory committees carry no more weight than non-statutory ones. They can be suspended (e.g. the Central Advisory Water Committee in 1952-54) and their terms of reference may turn out to be surprisingly flexible. The Central Advisory Council on Education (England) is performing useful work entirely compatible with its terms of reference, but it is not doing what the Minister said it would do when it was established.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, the more specific a statute is about membership, procedure and powers the more the committee may become out of touch in the course of time. If a Minister can make a committee strong and effective in various ways, then he can, if he so desires,

<sup>1</sup> See John Cohen, "Study of Committees and Conferences", *Public Administration*, Winter 1952, p. 361.

<sup>2</sup> See Chapter Four, p. 64, where Mr. Butler's speech commending the Council to the House of Commons (on 8 February 1944) is compared with the actual work of the Council.

lems in hand) and the views of many committee members and outside organisations—that they should give the Minister *their* advice, independently developed and presented.

### *The different types of committee*

The three different types of advisory committee are set out in Chapter Two, and it is clear from their basic functions that the sort of influence they have can be very different.

The first type is the consultative committee. Its influence is admittedly nebulous, and is sometimes alleged to be negligible. Those who look for definite results and decisions from the work of consultative committees will not find them; but to do so is to mistake their function. A good consultative committee may give each of its members only a vague and general idea of what other groups are feeling, but it succeeds if it gives them a reliable one. If, for example, a Minister leaves a meeting persuaded that the trade unions are genuinely worried about certain industrial developments, or if industrialists are convinced after a meeting that a department means business on some issue, the absence of precision does not mean that they have learnt nothing; on the contrary all parties will know much better how they stand. At most meetings of consultative committees things go very much as expected: startling departures are rare. The support of the TUC for better roads, mildly expressed, would have been expected and have made no great impact; but the very forceful and sustained pressure from the TUC at meetings of the National Production Advisory Council on Industry probably counted in the balance of policy-making. The fact that these committees are valuable both to the Government and to the other bodies represented is very important. Consultative committees enable the leaders of independent organisations to build up direct contact, not only with a few Ministers, but also with civil servants who are constitutionally anonymous. Consultative committees are perhaps best described metaphorically: they act as sounding-boards, or they may be said to enable Ministers (and others) to take the temperature of the water before plunging in. To ignore the value of this is to try to practise blindfold the art of the possible.

The value of a consultative committee can usually be reckoned up to a point by the frequency of its meetings. There is a tendency, however, to retain some which are not called at all often as stand-

Water Committee and the Advisory Council on Child Care. Even where there is no formal power a committee chairman may be able to persuade a Minister to refer a matter which his committee is anxious to tackle. Again, the power can be a useful weapon in the hands of a committee on particular occasions, but it is only capable of a moderate amount of effective use.

All these devices are methods of making an advisory committee in some way or other more independent of its department. But committees are means to ends: they help to deal with certain problems and to formulate policies on certain subjects. These ends are not always to be served by detachment and independence from departments, and hence a "strong" committee may not eventually achieve very much. It may be in a better position to fight its department, but it is also more likely to have to do so. Advisory committees only have independent power when they in fact embody all the relevant pressure groups or when they contain unchallenged experts. In these circumstances departments cannot easily turn elsewhere. But usually there are other authorities and other channels of advice—departmental experts, party or constituency pressure, or direct dealings with interest groups. A Minister can in most cases turn elsewhere for a counter-weight if he finds the advice of a committee unpalatable, and the best the committee can do is to try to persuade him that, after all, the views it advocates are the right ones. A committee should not merely present its conclusions: it should set out the evidence and arguments so that others may also be convinced.

The Central Health Services Council enjoys all the advantages described above (statutory security of existence and constitution, the right to publish, and the right of initiative) and has a high-level membership. Yet it has in some ways not achieved the position expected in some quarters—it does not control the Health Service, or even make the major decisions about it. The Minister's constitutional responsibility has ensured his effective control so long as he is determined to exercise it. The department itself takes a vital part in the administration of the Service, and the Minister, not the CHSC, controls the department. But the situation with this Council and in regard to the use of these "strengthening" devices generally illustrates the divergence which arises from time to time between the civil servant's view of advisory committees (that they should co-operate with him in dealing with the prob-

lems in hand) and the views of many committee members and outside organisations—that they should give the Minister *their* advice, independently developed and presented.

### *The different types of committee*

The three different types of advisory committee are set out in Chapter Two, and it is clear from their basic functions that the sort of influence they have can be very different.

The first type is the consultative committee. Its influence is admittedly nebulous, and is sometimes alleged to be negligible. Those who look for definite results and decisions from the work of consultative committees will not find them; but to do so is to mistake their function. A good consultative committee may give each of its members only a vague and general idea of what other groups are feeling, but it succeeds if it gives them a reliable one. If, for example, a Minister leaves a meeting persuaded that the trade unions are genuinely worried about certain industrial developments, or if industrialists are convinced after a meeting that a department means business on some issue, the absence of precision does not mean that they have learnt nothing; on the contrary all parties will know much better how they stand. At most meetings of consultative committees things go very much as expected: startling departures are rare. The support of the TUC for better roads, mildly expressed, would have been expected and have made no great impact; but the very forceful and sustained pressure from the TUC at meetings of the National Production Advisory Council on Industry probably counted in the balance of policy-making. The fact that these committees are valuable both to the Government and to the other bodies represented is very important. Consultative committees enable the leaders of independent organisations to build up direct contact, not only with a few Ministers, but also with civil servants who are constitutionally anonymous. Consultative committees are perhaps best described metaphorically: they act as sounding-boards, or they may be said to enable Ministers (and others) to take the temperature of the water before plunging in. To ignore the value of this is to try to practise blind-fold the art of the possible.

The value of a consultative committee can usually be reckoned up to a point by the frequency of its meetings. There is a tendency, however, to retain some which are not called at all often as stand-

bys, and the arguments for doing so are not without attractions. Consultation may be needed urgently and may be difficult to arrange without them. They are no trouble or expense and the fact that they are not being consulted may assure the relevant interests that nothing is afoot. But, in fact, such committees lose most of their effectiveness if they meet very rarely—it is only by fairly frequent meetings that personal understanding can be built up. A committee which has not met for several years is not likely to be a great success if it is suddenly called, and the function of “standby” consultative committees could usually be better served by informal arrangements.

A special class of consultative committees is that of consumer committees. Those that fall within the present study are described in Chapter Two. They have been widely criticised, and it is clear that they have great difficulties in becoming popular agents of consumer pressure. Looked at in the context of this report—as ordinary advisory committees—they appear as consultative bodies of middling importance, useful to the participants in the same way as other consultative committees. They provide useful contact between nationalised industries (and other producers) and organisations of consumers. Where the consumers are not organised as such, recourse is had to other bodies (for instance, on the Domestic Coal Consumers' Council to local authorities and various women's organisations). There was about the foundation of these committees, however, a sense of fresh accomplishment, an impression that a new way of bringing the consumer into the counsels of industry was being established. Nevertheless, they have not become vehicles of popular influence, nor forms of public accountability, and it is not likely that they could do so. Where the consumers are not organised they are not even very successful consultative committees. What is needed is some agency whereby individual consumers can be organised into effective interest groups, if possible with their own expert knowledge and constitutional means of deciding their attitude on various questions. Then consumer councils could be one of the channels of pressure. They cannot in practice combine both functions: that of gathering and consolidating the consumers' points of view, and also of providing a forum for the discussion of the issues arising. And their success with the second depends largely on whether the first is effectively and independently performed.



It is less easy to generalise about the influence of committees of the second type—those for expert advice—since they are so various. Some are high-level committees with a wide range of interest; others are specialist technical bodies. Some produce formal published reports and others only make their recommendations through minutes or occasional papers. Some are mainly composed of representatives; on others the members are appointed as individual experts. On some civil servants predominate, while others have none except the secretariat. Various relevant points have just been discussed as “general considerations”. It may be noted, however, that as committees become more general in scope they begin to approach the political level of policy-making. Bodies like the Central Housing Advisory Committee or the Television Advisory Committee deal with certain issues from a practical point of view and are not concerned with the politically controversial aspects. The same factor tends to diminish the influence of other high-level committees—at this level powerful political and other forces come into play and the committee has no monopoly of influence, even if it tackles the vital issues. Part of the influence of expert committees, especially of the less highly specialised ones, is similar to that of consultative committees—a matter of contacts and general discussion, of promoting understanding whatever the immediate decisions.

Those advisory committees which, under the classification suggested in Chapter Two, are really best regarded as administrative bodies, are by definition influential—indeed, virtually decisive. For this reason they are to a large extent outside the scope of this report. But they are not entirely outside it: so long as the Minister has powers he may exercise them and not follow the advice of the committee to the full. There is also genuine advice from bodies which are primarily managerial, like that of the Medical Research Council on, say, poliomyelitis vaccine, or the recommendations of the Historic Buildings Council. Obviously, the general authority of these bodies often gives their advice great weight but their position is not intrinsically different from that of expert committees in these circumstances. These committees are more than advisory, that is to say, for most of their activities; but when they do give advice their words must suffer the hazards common to the suggestions of all advisory committees.

In Chapter Two it was indicated that a few advisory committees

had something approaching quasi-judicial functions. They were classified as "administrative" since their conclusions are virtually decisive. Here it is only to be noted that their proceedings are even more confidential than those of other advisory committees, and it is very difficult to obtain information at all about some of them, such as the Political Honours Scrutiny Committee and the panel for security appeals. The few advisory committees that are really negotiating bodies<sup>7</sup> also reach conclusions that are in practice decisive, and it is pointless to assess their "influence".

### *Varying influence in different fields*

It remains to consider whether the achievements and prospects of advisory committees differ markedly in different fields and with different departments.

On balance it is probable that scientific committees have the strongest independent influence. This arises partly from their specialist prestige and partly from the pace of scientific change which makes it difficult for administrators to keep up. It is not only the more technical committees which are effective. The Advisory Council on Scientific Policy is usually concerned with general problems concerning manpower, the organisation of research, scientific libraries and so on, rather than with technical problems of a purely scientific character but it is made up of scientists since only they have the intimate knowledge of the scientific world which is needed to cope with the problems. Advisory committees at departments which deal with the social services emerge from time to time as strongly influential bodies, though liable to be overshadowed by the activities of reforming Ministers. Some of the more successful committees in these matters, like the National Insurance Advisory Committee and the Industrial Injuries Advisory Council, have strong powers but limited scope. Like the Advisory Council on Child Care and the Advisory Committee on Legal Aid, they have very great influence over the implementation of a major piece of legislation, but they are not in a position to bring about new developments. The functions of the major industrial committees have already been discussed in the comments on consultative committees. If the agenda of industrial advisory committees is largely confined to prospective Government action, then in periods when an attitude of com-

<sup>7</sup> Such as the Burnham Committees.

parative *laissez-faire* prevails the committees diminish in importance, and some may even be wound up. If however the committees undertake to review the general progress of the industry then they are less likely to find themselves becalmed.

There are periods when certain Ministries, or certain subjects, are not much troubled by political controversy—this has happened to agriculture, education, scientific policy, and others at different times. But even when political parties fail to provide the impulse to change, the need for policy-making goes on, and for these departments it surely accounts for the strength of advisory committees. Nevertheless, not all departments which are usually aside from the main party battles have a well-developed system of advisory committees. In some instances there may be little scope—there are no doubt better experts on taxation in Inland Revenue than there are outside. For similar reasons, the “common service” departments (Works, COI, HMSO) have not yet made great use of them. The Post Office has many local committees, but so far only a few at national headquarters. No doubt the Ministry of Defence, as distinct from the service departments, is too much a general department to find them helpful but a useful place might be found for consultative committees on special topics at the Foreign Office.

#### WIDER ASPECTS

No study such as this can be adequate without an attempt to relate it to the general system of government—to the national polity. The fundamental cause of the rise of advisory committees lies in the expansion of Government activities and in their greater complexity. Advisory committees are not spontaneous phenomena but are directly developed from other changes; they are not improved ways of dealing with old problems, but necessary ways of coping with new or transformed matters. It is in this context that their function must be studied.

Two questions must be asked. First, what is the function of advisory committees in the political system as a whole? And secondly, what light does this study of advisory committees throw on the nature of this political system?

Some issues have already been discussed, and these findings may be recapitulated first of all. The classification put forward in Chapter Two and the influence of the various types already con-

sidered in this chapter show that it is the consultative committees and the expert committees which are of central interest to this study. That is not to say that those committees classed as "administrative" or "negotiating" are not important; it is rather that their importance lies in other spheres of interest—in those of semi-independent bodies, of Government research, of salary negotiating machinery, and so on. Their position as "advisory" committees may be, for them, a significant feature of their constitutions, and it is a valuable and interesting device for retaining formal Ministerial control, but it only brings them within the general world of advisory bodies in a marginal way. The basic functions of advisory committees are indicated by the classification: but in addition to a department's need for consultation or expert advice or autonomous machinery, subsidiary purposes play a part in their establishment. These include placating outside pressure, launching a new policy on the public, and avoiding criticism on delicate issues. The advantages of committees over other methods of obtaining advice lie usually in their more systematic procedure, in the more comprehensive personal contacts which they ensure, in their general convenience and stability, and in the more formal commitments which they produce. The factors affecting their effectiveness have just been reviewed.

#### *Are committees important?*

There is no way of measuring the general importance of advisory committees: it is only possible to make hazardous judgements. The new functions of Government have brought many changes in administrative structure. Public corporations, quasi-judicial tribunals, and the specialised branches of the civil service are well-known features of these modern developments. Advisory committees are best regarded as counterparts to these changes: the formal expression at least of the expansion of government on the policy-making side. They have come to stay for they are generally accepted as stable and essential parts of the governmental system. Their role is really a distinctive one for which informal consultation could not be in all circumstances an adequate replacement; their function, that is to say, could not be performed in any other way. On these facts—their stability and distinctiveness—a judgement of their significance must be based. But whatever level their importance has reached so far, there is little question that it is growing.

But, measurement apart, can the political function of advisory committees be described more precisely? Their main significance is in the link they provide between the governmental system proper and the organisations in the community outside it. It used to be said that the function of the Minister was to tell the civil servants what the public would not stand. But there is now a great deal of direct influence on civil servants from the public, and advisory committees are part of this. Primarily, then, so far as the political system is concerned, advisory committees are to be regarded as an additional channel for policy-making, besides the ultimate electoral one.

There are great differences of course between these channels: between the "political" atmosphere of one and the "administrative" environment of the other, between the types of issues they deal with and the way their impact is made. It is only as routes by which new policies, and impulses to change policies, reach the decision-makers in the departments that there is an analogy between them. Advisory committees remain a collection rather than a system and they have little if any constitutional status; but they are increasingly useful, and what is useful soon becomes necessary.

### *Committees and Parliament*

What is the relationship between these two channels of influence? In the first place there is no denying that Ministers, and hence the electoral process on which they depend, are in the end decisive. They are the objectives on which various forms of influence must concentrate their attention. Nevertheless, Ministers are swayed not only by constituents and backbenchers: they are also influenced by civil servants and pressure groups and it is in the sphere of administration that formal advisory committees play a substantial if still subordinate part.

Professor K. C. Wheare has asked whether the growth of advisory committees may not be detrimental to Parliamentary power.

If Whitehall can claim the monopoly of knowledge and the agreement of the interested parties, what can Westminster do? Has not the development of this whole elaborate and remarkably efficient machinery of committees to advise strengthened Whitehall at the expense of Westminster?<sup>\*</sup>

\* K. C. Wheare, *Government by Committee* (Oxford), 1955, p. 67.

There is undoubtedly some truth in this suggestion. Ministers sometimes try to meet Parliamentary criticism by referring to the approval of experts or interested parties. But it is questionable whether MPs are altogether deterred by such protestations, and if they are it may well be because they are themselves attached to the interested parties. The real point is not that Ministers *claim* to be better informed because they have advisory committees, but that they *are* better informed. Parliament has not established formal arrangements for expert advice, nor do interest groups usually exert their main pressure through MPs. However, if there is fresh criticism of substance or an unappeased interest group at work in Parliament then a Minister will not be able to brush it aside.

Nor could the situation easily be otherwise. The strength of advisory committees and of Ministers advised by them, is limited in range and related to particular groups. If Parliament were to establish a system of rival experts, and of consultative bodies, then it might be better informed but it would lose the attachment to general issues (usually party matters) which characterises its proceedings and is the main source of its power. Advisory committees have grown in importance because they provide something not available elsewhere—direct consultation and specialist advice in some detail, aside from the party conflict.

The idea that politics and administration are completely different things is surely a myth, and so is the idea that civil servants are never policy-makers. Yet the myth is a pervasive one, and its influence can be seen in the belief that advisory committees are non-political bodies dealing with non-political subjects. A non-political subject, however, is merely one about which politicians do not feel strongly for the time being: all the description offers is a conventional distinction. Advisory committees perform what is really a prime political function—helping to form policy—in the conventionally “non-political” world of departmental administration.

This situation is emphasised by the fact that advisory committees do not tackle issues that have become “political”. It was pointed out, for example, on page 101, that some committees never become very effective because they are kept away from topics which are controversial in a party sense and these topics are the crucial ones. Of course some matters reported on by committees are debated in the Commons: the issues dealt with are not so different that there is no overlapping. Nor are the committee subjects neces-

sarily less important, though there is a tendency for them to be more specialised. But advisory committees deal on the whole with subjects, or aspects of subjects to which Parliament does not give the necessary attention, and on which policy must nevertheless be formulated. Where policy has emerged out of party conflict, advisory committees are weak. The root causes of the influence of advisory committees are the same as those which have brought about the crisis in Parliamentary control: the increased number of governmental functions, and the increase in their complexity.

But, surely, it was not to be expected that policy-making and popular control would remain the same with a greatly expanded set of Government functions. These functions increase the strength of Whitehall, and to some extent they increase it relatively to that of Westminster: but whether advisory committees increase the power of the central government relatively to that of other forces in the community is doubtful. If one method of policy-making is inadequate for the new conditions then it must be supplemented. Advisory committees are by definition largely recruited from outside the Government service, and they will not serve their purpose unless they are related to the most powerful groups and the most expert knowledge of the community. Departments cannot be sure that the advice they get will be congenial. Committees therefore cannot be simply added to the civil service as part of "Whitehall"—they are agencies through which the community's influence can be exerted. The increased power of Ministers and their departments is counterbalanced by their dependence on independent organisations: and advisory committees are a feature of that dependence.

### *"Government on the inner circle"*

Though advisory committees illustrate the Government's need for outside co-operation, they are not popularly elected bodies: and it may be felt that (even where their influence is substantial) they do not move the balance of power very far, merely from the central government departments to a political *élite*, to a small group of top people.

Advisory committees may be held, therefore, to be symptomatic of what Professor Ely Devons has called "government on the inner circle:"\*

\* Ely Devons, "Government on the Inner Circle", *The Listener*, 27 March 1958.

... political democracy implies a full participation by the general public in the argument and debate about issues of policy which affect them. How can this discussion be sensible and intelligent if crucial information is confined to the inner circle, and the public is merely served with clichés and platitudes through public relations officers and information departments?

There are two topics already discussed which are relevant to this question: plurality of membership, and privacy of proceedings. In Chapter Three rules about confidential proceedings were shown not to handicap committee members in their work. But even where the restrictions are lax it means that the ordinary members, not to mention the "clientele", of the organisation can only have at the most a very slight knowledge of what is afoot. The selection of a committee may involve serious limitation of the interests represented—many more may be concerned, at least occasionally, than are provided for. It is one thing to ask a group of people to help by discussing a set of problems and offering advice; it is another to preclude anyone else from contributing by giving only the committee access to information and to the various arguments put forward.

The discussion of plurality of membership in Chapter Three seemed to show that, though advisory committees are not dominated by pluralists, there are a number of people who serve on many committees. This situation arises from the methods of appointment, either by nomination or by the direct contacts of the department. Nomination leads to the appointment of persons active in the organisations, sometimes recognised committee-servers, and direct-contact appointments are obviously from people already known. It is clear, then, that the spread of appointments, in the nature of things, is not very wide.

There is a strong feeling both in Government circles and in the various organisations that privacy is essential.<sup>10</sup> During the research for this report it was suggested to many of those concerned that the meetings of the National Production Advisory Council on Industry might be held in public. The idea met with a cold reception. Though in some quarters there was sympathy for the principle of open discussion, it was universally believed that there

<sup>10</sup> This discussion is not intended to question in any way the obvious need for secrecy where national security may be involved; or on some quasi-judicial committees where applications and proceedings are completely confidential in the interests of the applicants.



would be much less frank speaking if privacy were removed—the Government would be less forthcoming and the independents would be even more guarded in their comments. It was also argued that the public interest was not affected until a definite policy line had been worked out by the Government. The NPACI is a body about which there is already a little publicity, and it is obvious that if secrecy is desired here then it is wanted for most other advisory committees too.

This attitude is too widespread to be dismissed as mere bureaucratic caution. There are in fact good reasons for it, and a good defence of privacy can be made out on the following lines. In the first place, it is said, the matter is one of practical convenience, not one of principle; it is natural and reasonable for Ministers and civil servants to talk to experts and leaders of organisations privately, just as contacts are made in any other walk of life. Publicity means commitment, and it is not possible for policy to be made without much tentative exploration and flying of kites. There is, it is argued, an analogy with international diplomacy: if everything is conducted in public, the chances of progress are diminished. Confidential proceedings are a condition, that is to say, of a committee's usefulness. Whatever the arrangements, there will always be certain things that people are prepared to say "off the record" which they will not say otherwise; nothing is gained, and something may be lost, by trying to prevent such conversations. If committee proceedings were in public, little insight would be gained, for the real discussions would then be held elsewhere, by informal methods.

Moreover, the view that publicity is a way of widening discussion is questionable; it may well be a way of destroying it. General participation may take place, but what ensues is no longer a discussion. A committee cannot do its best work in an atmosphere of public agitation.

The dangers of having a narrow circle of appointees may also be exaggerated. If relatively few people are appointed that is because there are few places to fill, and such plurality as there is arises because only one or two people have certain qualifications, or combinations of qualifications. Nor does it matter to the Government if a few leaders share the committee work, provided they are the genuine leaders—that is to say, provided they command the confidence of the followers. The circles from which com-

mittee members are drawn may be small, but they are not closed—the system of appointment merely accepts the existing situation, and if new powers arise they will be recognised. Advisory committees are parts of the administrative machine, and should be judged by their efficiency and effectiveness: they are not supposed to be democratic institutions.

It is not necessary to accept the whole of this defence to appreciate that it has force, and so far as the actual proceedings of committees are concerned it is surely decisive. But the balance of the argument seems to leave room for more publicity than at present. To allow more information about the progress of the work of committees would not necessarily lead, for instance, to campaigns in the popular press: the business of committees is usually too specialised for that. If even the reports of advisory committees are confidential then there can be no general intervention until departmental policy is settled. Discussion is then criticism, and criticism sounds like opposition. What is needed is rather the development of outside opinion at an earlier stage, before anyone has made up his mind. In the majority of cases relevant to advisory committees this will not be general public opinion but the views of specialised groups. The arguments for greater openness are those of liberal discussion, not of mass democracy.

In practical terms what is required is that more reports should be published, and that where desirable reports should be made for this purpose. These should include periodic reports on the work of consultative committees and some others. Where important expert committees make definite recommendations these should be published; if possible, before the Minister needs to make up his mind about them. The names of civil servants on the committees need not be published. Minority (or even individual) opinions should be included in the reports. Of course in order to minimise the flow of papers from HMSO, it would often be sufficient merely to remove restrictions from committee papers. "Publication" need not mean the printing and general circulation of highly specialised material. What is needed is the availability of information to those who want it. If reports and memoranda are thought to be unlikely to attract a wide circulation and too specialised to be worth publishing through HMSO then notice should be given in official publications (like the Board of Trade Journal) when committee documents become available.

So far as appointments are concerned, two things are required: some form of central check, and a greater effort by organisations to spread their nominations. The central control (perhaps exercised by that part of the Treasury which maintains the list of people suitable for public service<sup>21</sup>) should minimise plurality, including interdepartmental plurality, and the repetitiveness of appointments. The organisations might be induced to vary their nominations by the institution of rules restricting plurality and by enforcing rotation of membership on some committees. These measures would not transform the situation, for there are genuine limits of availability, and the success of committees cannot reasonably be jeopardised by the wholesale introduction of untried people. They would help, however, to moderate an unnecessary narrowness.

The danger with these two proposals is that one may counteract the other. If advice is published it may have the effect of making the circle of appointees even narrower. Rather than risk receiving politically embarrassing advice, Ministers will be careful to choose committee members with the right ideas. But though this danger is a genuine one it is something that ought to be faced, for the alternative—bold reports produced by strong committees which never see the light and can be quietly ignored—is of no service to anyone.

This raises the question of the real status of the committees and their recommendations. It is frequently urged that Ministers have no business either to reject or neglect the findings of committees. If persons are chosen to advise on specific questions, it is said, and then make substantially unanimous recommendations, which do not seriously impinge on what is outside their scope, there should be a strong presumption in favour of acceptance. But, as previously mentioned, it is clear that many Ministers and civil servants do not see the situation in this way at all. They regard advice as no more than advice; they value the work of committees in assembling information and systematically analysing problems, and they want to know what committees *think about future policy*. They do not feel called upon to share a committee's judgements on the material it has examined, and they want to be persuaded by a committee report, not to have to swallow it whole.

In the event those who dislike recommendations can usually

appeal to "wider considerations" of some sort in an effort to reject them. It must be recognised that those who carry the responsibility for action are entitled to the last word on what it should be; anything else would be unconstitutional. But it is no use expecting the best outside experts to go on serving on committees unless they feel their time is not wasted. This matter is particularly relevant to Royal Commissions and other temporary committees, but it is also important for standing advisory committees. Ministers no doubt find it wise and prudent to take the recommendations of all advisory bodies seriously. But public relations would be improved, to say no more, if reasons for rejection or delay were made as explicit as possible.

### *A search for rationality?*

This examination of controversies about advisory committees, and their function in modern government, has thrown some light on the working of the political system to-day. It is not too much to suggest that they offer a glimpse of a counter-system to popular democracy as a method of policy-making, that whereas party politics seek to provide what people want and to capture the public imagination, advisory committees (and informal consultation) entail a search for rationality. They involve interest groups, but their form and their purpose make reasoned argument the best weapon at the groups' disposal; the strength of a case can count for something, in these circumstances, as well as the power of the organisations. Advisory committees proceed by discussion and compromise, by argument and agreement; they constitute policy-making machinery for government at low temperature.

It has already been argued that advisory committees can only have strong influence when non-party issues are at stake—that is, when there is no great popular pressure on their subjects. These tend to be relatively narrow and specialised, and this is confirmed by the absence of any general system of co-ordination for the committees. Their inherent moderation is emphasised by their composition, which depends on established reputations and on organisations of recognised status and authority. The increase in importance of policy-making by this route is therefore faced with clear limits: committees are bound to their departmental origins, they have little direct access to public opinion, and they cannot cope with political or social issues of any scale.

For Ministers and their departments in search of policy guidance within these limits, then, advisory committees are likely to continue to grow in importance. It has been argued that they cannot easily avoid constituting an inner circle, and also that their value is more often in the personal contacts they promote than the recommendations they submit. Finally, then, it may be suggested that their aim of rational discussion, rather than partisan conflict, is typical of a "face-to-face society" (a society in which members have personal knowledge of each other)<sup>12</sup> and that the "inner circle" is best understood as such a society. For the rationality of committees is relative. It does not amount to cold logic or scientific analysis: there is a psychology of committees as of other groups. Such things are beyond the province of this report. It can only be said that there is very great value in bringing individual experts and leaders of national organisations into a face-to-face society with politicians and administrators; but that the crucial problem of democratic government must always lie beyond, in the relationships between the various leaders, who can know each other, and the people, too numerous to do so.

<sup>12</sup> See Peter Laslett, "The Face-to-face Society", in *Philosophy, Politics and Society* (Blackwell), 1956, p. 157.

## PART II

# Special Studies

### SPECIAL STUDY I

## ADVISORY COMMITTEES FOR SCOTLAND AND WALES

NOT much attention has been given so far in this report to those committees which are the consequence of devolution. This special study therefore describes the ways in which committees form part of the separate governmental machinery of Scotland and Wales.

Advisory committees concerned only with Scotland or Wales are a consequence of decentralisation, but where Northern Ireland is represented on committees (as on the NPACI or the Hill Farming Advisory Committee) it is for purposes of co-ordination—devolution in the six counties is achieved through the Belfast Parliament and the Northern Irish Government departments. This study therefore deals only with Scottish and Welsh committees. Even here many different arrangements exist: sometimes there are separate committees for England, Wales and Scotland, sometimes there are committees for England and Wales, with an additional committee for Wales and a separate committee for Scotland advising the Scottish department, and so on. The easiest way of assessing the system is to examine some examples of each variant in turn.

### SPECIALISED COMMITTEES

#### *Welsh committees at "England and Wales" departments*

Attached to some departments which are responsible for the affairs of England and Wales, there are committees with a particularly Welsh responsibility; but there are also parallel committees with a responsibility for both England and Wales. The Land Pests Advisory Committee, at the Ministry of Agriculture, considers, under the chairmanship of the Under Secretary responsible for the Infestation Control Division, more effective control

of animals (excluding rabbits, for which there is a separate committee) and birds harmful to agriculture in both England and Wales. There is also a Land Pests Advisory Committee for Wales; its terms of reference are almost identical but are confined to Wales and it meets under the chairmanship of the Welsh Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. The division of labour between these two committees is not very clear to the layman. The position is clearer for the Hill Farming Advisory Committee for England, Wales and Northern Ireland and the sub-committee for Wales and Monmouthshire. According to the statute<sup>1</sup> the sub-committee is responsible only for land in Wales and Monmouthshire, and half its members must be members of the main committee. To complete the picture, there is also a Hill Farming Advisory Committee for Scotland set up under the same section of the same Act, but advising the Secretary of State for Scotland.

The Central Advisory Councils for Education provide yet another example of overlapping responsibilities. Formally the Welsh Council is similar to the English Council; in practice, it has concerned itself with matters of exclusive interest to Wales, such as Welsh art and drama. Matters concerning the educational system as a whole, such as early leaving, are inevitably drawn into the net of the English Council, or of one of the other committees at the Ministry of Education. There is no Welsh representative on the English Council, but to prevent both Councils from doing the same work, the secretary of the English Council sees the minutes of the Welsh Council. Scotland has separate committees which will be discussed later.

*Scottish and Welsh committees at "Great Britain" departments*

There is a class of committees at central departments which deals exclusively with Welsh or Scottish affairs. At the Ministry of Works, there are the Historic Buildings Councils for Wales, Scotland and England, and similarly three Ancient Monuments Boards. At the Nature Conservancy, there are three national committees. There is also a Scottish United Services Museum Advisory Committee at the Ministry of Works, a Joint Standing Committee for the Wool Industry for Scotland at the Ministry of Labour, and a Scottish Transport Council at the Ministry of

<sup>1</sup> Hill Farming Act, 1945, s. 32 (1), (2), (3).

Transport. All these committees, it will be observed, are at Ministries which have responsibilities extending over the whole of Great Britain.

The Scottish Transport Council, set up in 1956 and meeting in Edinburgh, advises on the improvement and co-ordination of nationalised or state-aided transport undertakings, and consults with other transport interests. Outside the central lowland belt lying between Edinburgh and Glasgow, it is virtually impossible to make public transport pay: a sparse population spread over great distances<sup>3</sup> provides insufficient traffic; mountains, lochs and sea arms make the building of roads and railways difficult; bridges over sea arms are expensive, but the summer flood of visitors puts great pressure on the ferry services. In these circumstances, a competitive system is out of the question. Only the most careful planning and co-ordination of all types of road, rail, sea and air transport can provide an adequate service at less than exorbitant cost. This co-ordination is the function of the Council.

#### *Committees in Scotland parallel to Whitehall committees*

The next class of committees is confined to Scotland, and consists of those which correspond exactly to their English counterparts: for example, the Scottish Central Fire Brigades Advisory Council, the Scottish Police Council and the Advisory Committee on the Protection of Birds for Scotland. There are joint sub-committees of the English and Scottish Fire Brigades Advisory Councils which ensure that recommendations to these Councils on such subjects as pensions, design of appliances and uniforms are in identical terms. Such a procedure is desirable where uniformity is required, as the membership of the two councils is distinct. The Fire Brigades Unions, the Chief Fire Officers' Association and the National Association of Fire Officers are "Great Britain" bodies, but the local authorities are represented by the County Councils Association and the Association of Municipal Corporations in England and Wales, and the Association of County Councils in Scotland, the Counties of Cities Association and the Convention of Royal Burghs in Scotland. The views of the Scottish local authorities are always distinctive. The two

<sup>3</sup> The population of the Highlands and Islands is 277,000 (5 per cent of the population of Scotland). The area is 9 million acres or 47 per cent of the area of Scotland.



Councils are therefore independent, and the joint sub-committees are a co-ordinating device. The Scottish Police Council corresponds to the statutory Police Council in England and Wales, both having been set up under the Act of 1919. The Council has advisory functions in purely Scottish matters. There is a separate disciplinary code for Scottish police forces, and Scottish police forces had a centralised system of promotion examinations long before the English. Another example of this type of committee is the statutory Hill Farming Advisory Committee for Scotland, which is concerned with advising the Secretary of State on the exercise of his functions under the Hill Farming and Livestock Rearing Acts, 1946-56, including regulations about burning heather, the valuation of sheep, subsidies for hill sheep and cattle, and grants for improvements.

Some Scottish committees appear to fall into this category because their names are similar to those of English committees, but in fact they do not do so, because they work a little differently. Such committees are the Advisory Council on Education in Scotland, the Standing Committee on Supply and Training of Teachers for Further Education, and the Departmental Committee on the Supply of Teachers in Scotland. Their English namesakes are the Central Advisory Council for Education (England) and the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers.

The functions of the Scottish Advisory Council are wide. It advises on issues of educational policy and is probably the most important of the Scottish committees concerned with education. The Advisory Council publishes reports on many of the topics it considers, for example, *Libraries, Museums and Art Galleries*,<sup>3</sup> *Pupils with Physical Disabilities*,<sup>4</sup> *Further Education*.<sup>5</sup> Immediately after the war the Council also considered the supply of teachers and produced some reports on it, but on 1 May 1950 the Departmental Committee was appointed. In England many of these topics are taken by or are considered by separate committees, for example, the Victoria and Albert Museum Advisory Committee, the Science Museum Advisory Committee, the Secondary Schools Examinations Council, the National Advisory Council on Education for Industry and Commerce, the Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children, the Camping Advisory Committee, and

<sup>3</sup> Cmd. 8229.

<sup>4</sup> Cmd 8211, 1951.

<sup>5</sup> Cmd. 8454, 1952.

so on. The members of the Scottish Advisory Council are chosen to represent organisations which have educational interests, and in some cases there is informal consultation with interested organisations.

The two Scottish committees on the Training and Supply of Teachers are more limited in their functions than the National Advisory Council in England and Wales. The Standing Committee is limited to the supply and training of teachers for further education and thus does not cover the whole field. Like its English counterpart it is free to make recommendations. The Departmental Committee on the Supply of Teachers is a body with very limited functions. It is concerned purely with facts in working out how many teachers of what kinds will be needed at what time, and how many there are likely to be. It is no part of the Committee's function to make recommendations.

#### *Scottish committees without English counterparts*

Another category of committees consists of those which have no counterpart in England, although there would be no obstacle to their existence. Examples of such committees are the Amenity Committee and the Fisheries Committee set up under the Hydro-Electric Development (Scotland) Act, 1943, s. 9. These Committees are appointed by the Secretary of State for Scotland. The North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board and (since 1955) the South of Scotland Electricity Board must submit their constructional schemes to these Committees, which have the right to make recommendations to preserve the beauty and the fisheries of areas affected by the Boards' activities. The reports of the Committees are sent to the Boards, who must forward them to the Secretary of State, indicating whether they accept the recommendations.<sup>6</sup> In the case of the Tummel-Garry Scheme the recommendations of the two Committees were not accepted by the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board, and after a public enquiry the scheme was confirmed by the Secretary of State.<sup>7</sup> In other cases, the Committees have been more successful. The Board accepted the Fisheries Committee's recommendations on the Loch Shin scheme to instal fish passes in several places<sup>8</sup> and on the Breadalbane Scheme the Board agreed to site the Lubreoch

<sup>6</sup> Hydro-Electric Development (Scotland) Act, 1943, s. 9 (4).

<sup>7</sup> Cmd. 6660, 1954.

<sup>8</sup> Cmd. 8857, 1953.

Dam three miles farther upstream to reduce the spawning ground cut off.\* The Amenities Committee has raised questions concerning the flow of water in the streams, the siting of generating stations and the concealing of dumps and pipe lines. The Board discusses these questions with the two Committees while their schemes are still on the drawing board. Thus substantial alterations and improvements can be made while it is still possible to do this easily. These two Committees were set up to pacify those who feared that electrification of the Highlands would destroy their chief economic asset, the tourist industry based on the attractions of scenery and fishing. The Committees seem to have worked efficiently and they have been able to secure changes.

#### *Peculiarly Scottish committees*

Finally, there are those committees dealing with specifically Scottish problems. Such committees are the Scottish Valuation Advisory Council, the Local Government Audit Fees Committee, and the Scottish Peat Committee.

In Scotland, valuation is a function of the local authorities, and the work is done by assessors appointed by the County Councils and the Counties of Cities. The function of the Valuation Advisory Council, which is a new piece of machinery set up by the Valuation and Rating (Scotland) Act, 1956, is to advise the Secretary of State on valuation matters and, in particular, to consider the administrative schemes drawn up by the assessors for the valuation or revaluation of all types of property. At a recent meeting, the Council considered reports from the assessors on progress towards revaluing property by 1961. From these reports, the Council could pick out problems that were holding up the work and report them to the Secretary of State, who could, if necessary, draw the attention of the appropriate local authority to the difficulty. Thus the Council or the Secretary of State, on the report of the assessors, could have grounds for asking particular local authorities to speed up the work. If, for example, it were to be found that the timetable laid down in the Act on revaluation could not be adhered to, then the Council could propose amending legislation to the Secretary of State. It is expected that the Council will advise on many points arising out of the revaluation. The Council does not consider the value to be put on particular types

\* Cmd. 8740, 1953, p. 6.

of property, still less the valuation of individual properties. This is a question for the assessors and courts: consistency between different areas is achieved by discussion between the assessors and, of course, by court decisions. The Council publishes an annual report setting out briefly the work done and noting particular problems, such as, for example, the valuation of crofters' and squatters' dwellings which are being valued for the first time, and the shortage of qualified valuation staff. The Council is under the chairmanship of Lord Cameron, a Judge of the Court of Session, and is composed of ten members nominated by associations of valuation authorities, who are mainly either past or present councillors or chief officers, and four other members, two of whom are lawyers and two surveyors. The associations may nominate whom they like other than assessors.

The District Audit in Scotland is carried out by professional auditors appointed *ad hoc*. The Local Government Audit Fees Committee considers scales of fees for this work; in some instances this means considering an individual case as some Scottish local authorities are *sui generis*.

The Scottish Peat Committee is a technical committee concerned with the survey of Scottish peat resources and the possibilities of their commercial exploitation for fuel and other purposes, including use in peat-burning gas-turbines. The Committee began work in the immediate post-war period, influenced by the desire to develop natural resources and the need to find new sources of employment in the Highlands. Peat is proving a very expensive fuel for commercial purposes. The Scottishness of this Committee arises from the existence of peat in Scotland and its virtual absence from England.

#### THE HIGHLANDS AND ISLANDS

Among the more important committees and one with regional<sup>10</sup> and peculiarly Scottish responsibility is the Advisory Panel on the Highlands and Islands. The Panel was set up in 1947 and its terms of reference now are:

To keep under review, and advise the Secretary of State on the carrying out of the approved Programme of Highland Development; and to arrange, in consultation with the Secretary of State, for the investigation of further means of promoting the economic use of

<sup>10</sup> i.e., concerned with part only of Scotland.

capacity and resources in the Highlands and Islands and the social welfare of the Highland people.

The approved Programme of Highland Development was laid down in the First Review of Highland Development published as a White Paper in 1950.<sup>11</sup> A second White Paper was published in 1959.<sup>12</sup>

The Panel is composed of some twenty-two members appointed by the Secretary of State for a four-year term. These include nominees of the principal local authorities of the Highlands and Islands<sup>13</sup> and of the Scottish Council (Development and Industry), Highland and Island Members of Parliament and other persons with personal knowledge and experience of Highland affairs, under the chairmanship of Lord Cameron. One Independent (formerly Conservative) and one Labour Member of Parliament prefer not to become members of the Panel. Officials from Government departments sit on the Panel as "assessors"; these are senior officials usually of Assistant Secretary rank, not only from the Scottish Departments, but also from the Forestry Commission, the Board of Trade and the Ministry of Labour. Other departments attend as required. The Hydro-Electric Board, the White Fish Authority, the Herring Industry Board and the Scottish Tourist Board are also represented; their officials do not attend every meeting, but receive all the papers. All these officials give much time and attention to the work of the Panel. There is considerable continuity among the membership of the Panel, some having served since 1947 and some officials having been associated with it, in one capacity or another, throughout its life. The Panel receives secretarial assistance from the Scottish Home Department and the Department of Agriculture.

The Panel as a whole meets quarterly in Inverness; the greater part of its detailed work is done by its loosely organised groups (sub-committees). At present there are four groups: one dealing with agriculture and forestry, one with fisheries and harbours, one with sea and air transport, and one with road and rail transport and tourism. Members of the groups with the appropriate officials in attendance have met in different parts of the Highlands and Islands to see problems for themselves on the spot. Not only is this

<sup>11</sup> Cmd. 7976.

<sup>12</sup> Cmd. 785.

<sup>13</sup> The Counties of Argyll, Inverness, Ross and Cromarty, Sutherland, Caithness, Orkney and Shetland, and the Burgh of Inverness.

essential for the members, but it enables the officials also to see for themselves; and it reassures the local people that their problems are being attended to, particularly if the visit occurs out of the tourist season. In the remote places it is difficult to find accommodation for the whole Panel and the officials, who together number some thirty-five people. Thus, to take a recent example, the chairman of the Fisheries Group and two or three other members, accompanied by senior officers of the Fisheries Division of the Scottish Home Department and of the White Fish Authority, made several visits to the Outer Islands during 1959 in order to examine methods of reviving the local fishing industry by using modern techniques. The Panel may also invite interested parties to come to Inverness to give evidence.

The discussions of the Panel are confidential. No reports are issued; its recommendations to the Secretary of State are contained in the minutes. After each meeting, a statement is made to the press explaining what the Panel has been discussing and, unless the recommendations are confidential, stating what recommendations have been made to the Secretary of State. Because the proceedings are confidential, the civil servants feel able to speak quite freely.

The Panel seeks to encourage all activities useful to Highland development. It is considering, for example, the reorganisation and modernisation of the (Government assisted) Western Isles sea services of David MacBrayne Ltd., increased afforestation with the attendant problem of attracting labour and acquiring land for planting, the need for extended processing facilities for the fishing industry in Shetland and in other places and the possibility of attracting industry to the Highlands. The Panel considers therefore questions of immediate practical importance that bring it into contact with other public and private bodies. Lord Cameron describes the Panel's work in these words:<sup>14</sup>

It has acted and acts as a centre of informed discussion where the problems of the Highlands and Islands as a whole can be focussed and examined, where local interests and projects can be concerted and fitted into an overall pattern. It is a testing ground for ideas and theories. It is a means of bringing pressure to bear in support of local authorities and regional bodies upon such important factors in the Highland economy as the national transport authorities of land and

<sup>14</sup> "Ten Years in the Highlands", *Scotland*, January 1957, p. 18.

air in order to secure effective recognition of and provision for the peculiar needs of the Highlands and Islands.

Lord Cameron went on to state that "all major pier, harbour and road projects now already under way in the Highlands have owed something at least to the persistent and reasoned advocacy of the Panel". The Panel recommended the appointment of the Taylor Commission, which in turn led to the setting up of the Crofters' Commission with wide executive functions and powers. The Panel has also pressed strongly for more capital development in the Highlands, especially for roads. The North Ford Causeway, linking Benbecula to North Uist and costing £250,000, was started largely as a result of its recommendations. Several references to the Panel's activities are to be found in the Review of Highland Policy.<sup>15</sup> The priorities of new road projects are to be considered jointly by the Government, the highway authorities and the Panel.<sup>16</sup> The development of transport facilities in the Highlands, whether by road, rail, air or sea, is being examined by the Panel and the Scottish Transport Council jointly.<sup>17</sup> Development surveys for forestry were started in 1948 at the suggestion of the Panel. The first area surveyed was Strathoykell, where 7,000 acres have now been planted with trees, and employment and the number of stock carried have increased.<sup>18</sup> The Panel also suggested that a fishing fleet could be developed in the Minch if young men were educated in modern techniques. The Secretary of State, the White Fish Authority and the Herring Industry Board then considered how this suggestion could be put into practice<sup>19</sup> and at the end of 1959 a Government scheme for training these fishermen in techniques used effectively by east coast fishermen was announced.

The effectiveness of the Panel is the result largely of its ability to voice the needs of the Highlands and of its links with executive bodies—the Tourist Board, the Scottish Council, the Hydro-Electric Board, the Herring Industry Board, the transport authorities, the local authorities, and Parliament itself; and the presence of officials from the Scottish departments ensures that the Panel's views are known to the civil servants as well as making available to the Panel the practical experience of the civil servants and the resources of their departments. In short, the Panel has succeeded in

<sup>15</sup> Cmd. 785, 1959.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 15.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 10.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 22.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 23.

becoming in some ways part and parcel of the governmental and administrative machine without sacrificing its position as an independent body, with an outstanding chairman.

#### THE COUNCIL FOR WALES AND MONMOUTHSHIRE

The relations of the Council for Wales and Monmouthshire with the Government have not always been so happy. The Council was appointed in April 1949 with the following terms of reference:

- (1) To meet from time to time, and at least quarterly, for the interchange of views and information on developments and trends in the economic and cultural fields in Wales and Monmouthshire; and
- (2) To secure that the Government are adequately informed of the impact of Government activities on the general life of the people of Wales and Monmouthshire.

Lord Morrison of Lambeth, then Lord President of the Council, attended the first meeting and explained the Government's interpretation of the terms of reference. The Council was not to be simply a platform from which Welshmen could express their opinions in public. Nor was the Council a Welsh Parliament taking decisions which ought not to be arrived at without full public discussion. Lord Morrison continued:

It is an advisory body which will only succeed if there can be frank and free discussion between its members and the Government. It should be a body in which there will be no loss of face as a result of a defeat in friendly argument, in which members will be ready to speak their minds without an eye to the gallery, in which Ministers will be able to talk as among colleagues and not across the floor to a hostile opposition whose constitutional duty it is to oppose, in which when the occasion arises confidence can be exchanged in a spirit of trust.

This sort of relationship has not always been achieved.

The first members of the Council were appointed by the Prime Minister for a term of three years: twelve to represent local authorities to retire in rotation, eight industry, including agriculture (four from management and four from the workers), one to be nominated by the Welsh Tourist Board, one by the National Eisteddfod and two to represent education (one from the Uni-



versity of Wales and the other the Welsh Joint Education Committee, which represents all Welsh local education authorities), and finally three to be nominated by the Prime Minister. The local authority members were appointed from a list submitted by the local authorities, each being entitled to put forward one name. In making the appointments a balance was sought between the different regions of Wales and between the different types of authority: thus five members were drawn from County Councils, two from County Boroughs, two from Urban Districts, two from Rural Districts and one from Boroughs. The members from industry were also appointed from lists of nominations, one from the National Farmers' Union, one each from the National Industrial Development Council for Wales and Monmouthshire and the Industrial Association of Wales (the Welsh equivalent of the Federation of British Industries), one from the nationalised industries and four from the Welsh Regional Council of Labour. The chairman, Alderman Huw Edwards, was appointed in the first instance by the Prime Minister, but was re-elected annually until his resignation from the Council in October 1958.

After four years the Council was asked by the Government to suggest changes. The changes suggested by the Council (some of which the Government accepted) were prompted by two motives: the desire to retain some of the experienced representatives from local authorities and the desire to prevent organisations which nominated members from thinking they could require their nominees to report back to them. The number of the Prime Minister's nominees was increased from three to eight, so as to increase the number selected on their merits. These eight members also replaced the four nominated by the University of Wales, the Welsh Joint Education Committee, the Welsh National Eisteddfod and the Welsh Tourist and Holidays Board. Neither the Council nor the Panels (the committees of the Council) co-opted additional members.

In 1959, after the resignation of the chairman and several other members, the Council was again reconstituted. The appointments have been made more on a personal basis than was the case on previous occasions, but the need to ensure that major Welsh interests are represented has been recognised, so that, as before, agriculture, industry, education and local government are represented, and for the first time, also the Free Church and the Church

in Wales. Unlike the Panel for the Highlands and Islands, the Council for Wales and Monmouthshire has no Members of Parliament as members. The Council and its Panels now have power to co-opt. For a time, the Minister for Welsh Affairs took the chair, but the Council has now returned to electing its own chairman.

The Council has met at least four times each year, the timing of its meetings being dependent on the progress of work of its Panels (sub-committees). The detailed work of the Council has been done by the Panels. Both the Panels and the Council have met in different parts of the country, as was suggested by Lord Morrison in his speech to the first meeting of the Council. The Panels have invited evidence for their detailed studies and have consulted with the Welsh offices of Government departments both on the subject-matter of their reports and on their recommendations. Since 1947 the secretariat has been provided by the Welsh office of the Ministry of Housing and Local Government, but before that, the Welsh Board of Health provided the secretariat. It has been the practice for the Government to publish the reports and memoranda of the Council.

The bulk of the time of the Council and its Panels has been spent on their major reports on *Rural Depopulation*, *Unemployment*, the *South Wales Ports*, *Rehabilitation of Marginal Land* and *Government Administration in Wales*.<sup>20</sup> The Reports on the South Wales Ports, on Rural Depopulation and on Government Administration are substantial pieces of work, and the last two have caused quarrels between the Panel and the Government in London. They have also considered relatively minor questions such as the drafting of income tax forms in Welsh, the Welsh flag, particular projects, such as the Severn Bridge, and the provision of books in Welsh for adults.

The Report on Rural Depopulation made two major recommendations: first that some £60 million be set aside for the development of housing, roads, sewerage and other services, and secondly that a special organisation be set up "to apply the financial assistance by carrying out or aiding the necessary works of improvement and development"<sup>21</sup> over a twelve-year period.

<sup>20</sup> 1st Report, Cmd. 8060, Oct. 1950; 2nd Report, Cmd. 8844, July 1953; Report on the South Wales Ports, Cmd. 9359, Jan. 1955; 3rd Report, Cmd. 53, Jan. 1957; 4th Report, Cmd. 631, Jan. 1959.

<sup>21</sup> Cmd. 8844, para. 301.

The Council was therefore asking for special help for rural Wales and was suggesting the creation of a special body, whose relations with the local authorities were none too clearly defined. It would be difficult, but not impossible, for a United Kingdom Government to carry out these proposals. The Report was sent to the Minister for Welsh Affairs at the end of February 1953 and was published in July. In November the Government published its own White Paper on Rural Wales,<sup>22</sup> in which it agreed with the general conclusion that rural Wales needed help, but refused to accept either of the major proposals put forward by the Council. In December, the Council sent a reply to the Government, which it also circulated to Members of Parliament as a debate was pending. This expressed its dissatisfaction with the Government's reply and in particular with the absence of any consultation during the period between the submission of the Council's Report and the publication of the Government's White Paper. The Council also said it viewed "with great disappointment and apprehension the conclusion that the Government had not sufficient confidence in it to enter upon consultation".<sup>23</sup>

The quarrel with the Government over the Report on Government Administration<sup>24</sup> has followed a similar pattern, though with wider-reaching consequences. The Council submitted its report at the end of September 1956 and it was published in 1957. The report proposed the creation of a Welsh Office and Welsh Departments of State and the appointment of a Welsh Secretary of State on the Scottish model. The intention was to achieve "parity with Scotland", so that Welsh problems should receive as much attention as it was thought Scottish ones did. Such a reorganisation would cause a major upheaval in the central departments in London and is not one to which a Government could lightly agree. On 11 December 1957 the Prime Minister wrote to the chairman a brief letter, explaining that he could not agree to the Council's proposals, but that the Minister for Welsh Affairs (by this time the Minister of Housing and Local Government) should be assisted in his work by a Minister of State. The Prime Minister also announced some other minor changes. Thus the Council's report achieved some results. A few days before, Mr. Macmillan had received Mr. Huw Edwards and explained the Government's

<sup>22</sup> Cmd. 9014.

<sup>23</sup> Cmd. 53, Jan. 1957, pp. 1-83.

<sup>24</sup> Para. 10, Memorandum of 7 December.

position to him. On 15 May and after a rather unsatisfactory meeting with the Minister for Welsh Affairs the Council replied to the Prime Minister's letter, expressing their dissatisfaction with what they considered to be the inadequacy of the measures proposed by the Prime Minister and also the cursory manner in which their proposals—the result of two years' hard work—had been dismissed.

Even if the Prime Minister could not agree to the detailed proposals made in the Report, we are extremely disappointed that the opportunity was not taken to set out in the reply in a similarly detailed way and in precise terms exactly why the Prime Minister considered that the Panel's arguments and conclusions were unacceptable. If the opportunity had been taken to do this we feel that the Government, from the inside as it were, could have materially advanced knowledge and understanding of the administrative problems facing Wales today.<sup>11</sup>

The Prime Minister, replying in July, suggested that the Minister for Welsh Affairs should be invited to discuss these matters with the Council. At the end of September the Minister came down to meet the Council. This meeting appears not to have been entirely successful, for on 24 October the chairman, Alderman Huw Edwards, resigned. The Prime Minister thereupon appointed the Minister for Welsh Affairs as chairman. This appointment was much criticised, some members of the Council declaring it to be unconstitutional and the chairman of the Government Administration Panel saying it was "an insult to Wales"; but, in contrast, other members thought it would give opportunities for closer contact with the Government. By the end of the year four more members of the Council had resigned. In August 1959, Alderman Huw Edwards resigned from the Labour Party and then joined the Welsh Nationalists.

There have thus been five stages in the relations of the Council with the Government. The first five years were fruitful years of co-operation. Then followed the clash over the Report on Rural Depopulation. The Government must have resented the Council's sending a memorandum to Members of Parliament—an action more suggestive of a pressure-group than of a Government advisory committee. The third stage was a happier period when

<sup>11</sup> Cmd. 631, para. 15.

both Council and Government worked at restoring the relationship which was shattered again by the Report on Government Administration. Shortly after the submission of this report, responsibility for Welsh affairs was transferred, in January 1957, to the Minister of Housing and Local Government. Perhaps because it was hoped that the change would lead to an improvement, the deterioration which in fact followed (the fourth stage) was the more keenly felt. Relations deteriorated throughout 1957 and 1958, culminating in the resignation of the chairman, Mr. Huw Edwards, and four other members in October. The fifth stage is one of reconciliation. After Mr. Henry Brooke took over the chairmanship relations gradually returned to normal. On 11 September 1959 the Prime Minister declared his intentions for the Council: if the Conservatives were returned to power the Council would be reconstituted for another three-year term as an independent and representative body, electing its own chairman and with power to co-opt to its Panels and committees; there would be effective machinery for ensuring regular contact with the Government in that, in addition to normal meetings, the Minister should take the chair sometimes so that the Council could discuss any matter with him personally, or he should be able to call a meeting under his chairmanship if he had urgent business concerning Wales to discuss with the Council.

There were no difficulties for the Council until it took up major issues—issues which the Council itself had chosen. It may be surmised from the experience of other advisory committees that such large and important topics are not considered suitable by Government departments. In its work the Council consulted the Welsh offices and received help (acknowledged in its reports) from the Conference of Heads of Government Departments in Wales. It is possible that this consultation did not go far enough, in that it was confined to the Welsh offices and seems to have been restricted to a discussion of existing facts, and to have excluded a detailed discussion of the measures proposed by the Council. It is just possible that, had there been more consultation between the Council and the Government on the measures proposed by the Council, the Government might have been able to accept some, at least, of the recommendations. But it should not be thought that the Council achieved nothing. The quarrels with the Government drew not only the Government's attention but also that of the

public to the problems studied by the Council, thus preparing the way for action.

It is clear that the Government in London has attempted to meet the demands of the Welsh. A good deal of economic help has been forthcoming, so that only North-West Wales is now in need. There have been measures to recognise the fact that Wales is not simply a region of England, though these may not have been altogether successful: it is difficult for the headquarters of a department to grant any effective measure of independence to its other offices. It is possible that the Government in London has not taken sufficient thought to consider the susceptibilities of the members of the Council. It is probable that the methods used for disposing of the reports of the Council are no different from those used for disposing of the reports of any other advisory committee. But the Council for Wales and Monmouthshire is unlike any other advisory committee: it has a national competence covering all Wales and it has a general competence covering all topics. (The Panel for the Highlands and Islands has a general competence, but deals only with part of Scotland; and the other Scottish committees have a national competence, but one limited to particular topics.) The result of this peculiarity of the Welsh Council is that it is very easy for Welsh people to regard it as something more than a mere advisory committee—as something which involves their national aspirations and national pride. The reports and memoranda of the Council show a recognition of the Council's advisory status, but it has not hesitated to interpret its terms of reference very widely. Thus the Council and the Government in London have been at cross-purposes. At the time of Mr. Brooke's accession to the chairmanship this seems to have been recognised, and the improvement in relations between the Government and the Council since then gives hope that a serious attempt is being made to work out a proper place for the Council in the whole machinery of government in Wales.

## FIFTEEN MAJOR COMMITTEES

THE following studies describe the composition and functions of some of the more important advisory committees. Industrial, scientific and social service bodies are included, but the selection obviously does not purport to be a representative sample of the 500 committees. Most are consultative or expert committees under the classification suggested in Chapter Two, but there is one example (the Burnham Committees) of a negotiating committee with advisory status, and one advisory body (the former Colonial Research Council) which in practice had administrative functions.

- National Production Advisory Council on Industry (Treasury and Board of Trade)
- Economic Planning Board (Treasury and Cabinet Office)
- National Joint Advisory Council (Ministry of Labour)
- Consultative Committee for Industry (Board of Trade)
- Engineering Advisory Council (Board of Trade)
- Agricultural Improvement Council (Ministry of Agriculture)
- Advisory Council on Scientific Policy (Office of the Minister for Science)
- Advisory Council on Scientific Research and Technical Development (Ministry of Aviation)
- Central Housing Advisory Committee (Ministry of Housing and Local Government)
- National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers (Ministry of Education)
- Central Health Services Council (Ministry of Health)
- National Insurance Advisory Committee (Ministry of Pensions and National Insurance)
- Television Advisory Committee (Post Office)
- Burnham Committees (Ministry of Education)
- Colonial Research Council (Colonial Office)

NATIONAL PRODUCTION ADVISORY COUNCIL  
ON INDUSTRY

(H.M. Treasury and Board of Trade)

This Council (NPACI) can trace its origin to the Central Joint Advisory Committee set up on 2 July 1941, at the suggestion of the British Employers' Confederation and the Trades Union Congress, to advise the Production Executive on "general production difficulties". Regional Boards responsible to the Production Executive had already been set up, and the Executive was to refer to the Committee matters relating to production arising from the proceedings of the Regional Boards. Questions of wages were excluded from its terms of reference. The Committee was composed of thirteen representatives from each side of industry. It met five times; but the initiative in proposing topics for discussion came mainly from the members, rather than from the Government. The members found it an unsatisfactory situation. They were convinced that the Government could learn much from their specialised knowledge and experience, but the Government feared lest the Committee should limit the application of its powers and authority.

A committee under the chairmanship of Sir Walter Citrine,<sup>1</sup> anxious to see more co-operation between the Government, employers and work people, recommended the reorganisation of the Committee. As a result, in August 1942 the name of the Committee was changed to "the National Production Advisory Council". It consisted of eleven members appointed by the Minister of Production from among the vice-chairmen of the Regional Boards, three representatives of the British Employers' Confederation, three representatives of the Federation of British Industries and six representatives of the TUC, making twenty-three in all. The Minister made all appointments from nominations submitted by these bodies. The terms of reference were not changed.

In December 1942 the Minister of Production, Mr. Oliver Lyttelton, took the National Production Advisory Council into his confidence, and gave it full information.<sup>2</sup> He did this because

<sup>1</sup> Citrine Report, Cmd. 6360, May 1942. See also J. D. Scott and Richard Hughes, *Official History of the Second World War: Administration of War Production*, pp. 421-2 and pp. 468-70.

<sup>2</sup> See Scott and Hughes, *op. cit.*, p. 487.



he wished to use the Council and the Regional Boards as an emollient in the Government's control of industry for the war effort. They were to explain to industries and to individual firms why, for example, contracts could not be placed with particular firms. They were also to give to the Ministry of Production information about surplus capacity.

### *The Post-war Council*

After the war in October 1945 the National Production Advisory Council was adapted to peace-time needs.<sup>3</sup> It changed its name slightly to "the National Production Advisory Council on Industry", and its terms of reference were modified to include all aspects of industrial policy except the wages and conditions of employment. They now are:

To advise Ministers upon industrial conditions and general production questions (excluding matters which are normally handled by the joint organisations of trade unions and employers in connection with wages and conditions of employment) and on such subjects as may arise from the proceedings of the Regional Boards for Industry.

As the Council's field of interest covers the whole of industry, including agriculture, the extractive industries and shipping, any general economic or financial matters bearing on industry can be discussed; for example, the road programme or the free trade area.

When first established the National Production Advisory Council was the responsibility of the Ministry of Production. In October 1945 this Ministry was merged with the Board of Trade, which then became responsible for the Council. There were further changes in 1947. A Minister for Economic Affairs was appointed and the Regional Boards were transferred to him from the Board of Trade; a little later (in November) the Minister for Economic Affairs, Sir Stafford Cripps, became Chancellor of the Exchequer as well. Thus the National Production Advisory Council on Industry became the responsibility of the Treasury, and of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. In April 1952 the secretarial work was transferred to the Board of Trade.

In November 1959, after representations by the TUC, it was agreed that steps should be taken to make the attendance (as distinct from the membership) at the NPACI smaller, to make its

<sup>3</sup> See article on the NPACI in the *Board of Trade Journal*, 1 January 1960, p. 3.

procedure more informal, and for more proposals on particular issues to be put forward for discussion.

### *Membership*

The Chancellor of the Exchequer remains chairman of the Council and he prescribes its constitution. He is not, however, the only Minister to attend. The President of the Board of Trade usually attends and may be accompanied by the Minister of State and the Parliamentary Secretary. Among other departments frequently represented by Ministers or their Parliamentary Secretaries are Power; Transport; Agriculture, Fisheries and Food; Labour; Housing and Local Government; and the Paymaster-General's Office. Ministers are accompanied by officials only if necessary, and in view of the desire to limit the numbers attending this rule is likely to be strictly interpreted in the future.

Nine representatives of employers are chosen, by the Federation of British Industries, the British Employers' Confederation, the National Union of Manufacturers and the Association of British Chambers of Commerce. A member of the National Farmers' Union is normally among the FBI representatives. There are also nine members chosen by the Trades Union Congress. These come from the Production Committee. Industrial organisations may send members of their headquarters staffs either as members or as deputies for other members. The nationalised industries have two representatives, one for transport and the other for fuel and power. The Council is closely linked with the Regional Boards for Industry and the chairmen of the eleven Boards are all members. The Iron and Steel Board sends an observer. The Government of Northern Ireland sends two representatives (one employer and one trade unionist) as observers. There are, then, thirty-one members of the Council not counting the chairman and other Ministers and officials, or the observers from the Iron and Steel Board and from Northern Ireland. Substitution is allowed and before November 1959 there was no objection to members bringing others who might usefully contribute to the discussions. In general, others may now only attend as deputies for absent members. There is a good deal of continuity of membership.

### *Methods of work*

Although the Chancellor of the Exchequer is chairman of the

Council, the secretariat is provided by the Board of Trade. This has been found convenient since the Board provides the headquarters organisation for the Regional Boards for Industry. The Board therefore prepares the agenda and keeps the minutes. Meetings are held quarterly. Additional meetings can be held, but this is rare; it is more usual in an emergency to call the Interim Committee. This Committee may also deal with detailed matters referred to it by the Council. The Committee is presided over sometimes by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but more often by the Minister particularly concerned with the topic under discussion. All the organisations represented on the Council are represented on the Committee, but they send fewer representatives.

At each meeting the Chancellor of the Exchequer gives a review of the economic situation. The Ministers of the departments concerned with industry present reports, and a paper based on the reports of the regional chairmen keeps the Council in touch with regional variations and local problems. Papers on particular topics may be submitted to the Council. These are usually prepared by the departments, but there is no reason why other members should not present papers. There is no question of voting since it is not the purpose of the Council to arrive at decisions.

The Treasury Information Division issues a copy of the chairman's statement and a Treasury official (usually the Head of the Information Division) discusses with industrial correspondents of the press what took place at the meetings. The official discusses briefly with the groups present at the end of the meeting what is to be said to the press: sometimes they ask him to make clear the attitude they have taken on certain issues. This practice is a later development which arose on the request of the press—there were no such statements or conferences when the NPACI began.

The Council is not a "Parliament of Industry" but it is the nearest approach to such a body that exists in Britain. Its main value so far has been as a forum for discussion on the general state of the economy: the main industrial organisations and relevant Ministries are all brought together at one meeting, and particular issues concerning these bodies are put in the context of general policy. The Council is also valuable as a place where regional issues are brought forward and local problems put before central authorities at the highest level; and in addition it serves as a con-

venient vehicle for Government pronouncements designed to impress the facts of the economic situation on the community, though if necessary other adequate means could be found for this "propaganda" work. A possible criticism of the Council so far is that its meetings have had too much the character of "embattled set-pieces", and in November 1959 various reforms were set in hand to make the NPACI a more useful, a more flexible and a less formal body.

### ECONOMIC PLANNING BOARD

(H.M. Treasury and Cabinet Office)

The Economic Planning Board was set up in July 1947 by Lord Morrison of Lambeth, then Lord President of the Council and responsible for the co-ordination of economic affairs. It came under the auspices of Sir Stafford Cripps on his appointment as Minister of Economic Affairs in September 1947 and continued with him as Chancellor of the Exchequer. It is serviced by the Treasury and Cabinet Office and carried on the Treasury Vote.

Its basic structure has changed very little since it was established, and there has only been slow change in membership. There have been fluctuations in the role it has played in the machinery of policy-making; nowadays it meets more frequently than it did a few years ago.

At the time when the Board was set up there were ideas in Government circles that a long-term plan for the use of Britain's economic resources should be drawn up, and the Board was to assist in this work. The original terms of reference stated that:

The primary aim is to advise H.M. Government on the best use of our economic resources, both towards the realisation of a long-term plan and on remedial measures against our immediate difficulties.

In June 1950 Sir Stafford Cripps redefined its functions as "to advise H.M. Government on the best use of our economic resources", and the Board has always been concerned with general economic problems. The Board considers many economic matters, but as aspects of general policy, not in any detail.

#### *Membership*

At present the Board consists of seven official members and seven outside members, all appointed by the Chancellor of the

Exchequer. The official members are all civil servants. Since October 1956 the Joint Permanent Secretary to the Treasury has been the chairman; the other official members have been the Second Secretary of the Treasury; the Economic Adviser to Her Majesty's Government; one Third Secretary of the Treasury; and the Permanent Secretaries to the Board of Trade, the Ministry of Labour, and the Ministry of Power. These are personal appointments, but the range of possible variation of posts represented is not great.

The seven non-official members include three trade unionists and three businessmen. The trade unionists are at present: Sir Vincent Tewson (General Secretary, TUC), Mr. J. A. Birch (Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers) and Mr. W. E. Jones (National Union of Mineworkers). They are all nominated by the TUC and are members of its General Council.

The industrial members at present are: Sir Graham Cunningham (Triplex Safety Glass Co. Ltd.), Mr. Basil Sanderson (Shaw Savill & Albion Co. Ltd.) and Mr. Hugh Weeks (Trussed Concrete Steel Co. Ltd.). These are nominated by the Federation of British Industries and the British Employers' Confederation in collaboration. The seventh non-official member is Sir Roger Makins, formerly Joint Permanent Secretary to the Treasury and now with the Atomic Energy Authority. Lord Plowden, the first chairman of the Board, served on it from 1947 until 1960.

Other senior civil servants occasionally attend meetings of the Board, when matters concerning them are under consideration. There is considerable continuity of service; Sir Vincent Tewson and Sir Graham Cunningham and several civil servants have been members for a long period. There is no fixed term of service: members often go on until retirement, change of job, etc.

#### *Meetings and methods*

The Board now meets about eight or nine times a year. There are two secretaries; at present one is a Principal in the Treasury, the other an Assistant Secretary in the Cabinet Office. Papers for the Board to consider are prepared by the Treasury or Board of Trade or, occasionally, by other departments or by members of the Board themselves. The usual aim is to circulate papers, statistics, etc., beforehand, instead of making statements at the meeting, as this produces better discussion.

In the main meetings are concerned with the informal exchange of views on matters of economic policy. The minutes are the only resulting documents—no memoranda or reports are produced. The views of the Board may of course be conveyed to Ministers and other civil servants by the chairman. In one or two cases the Board does more than exchange views. Members see some Government economic documents in draft, comment on them and suggest amendments. They may consider reports by officials on trade, exports, etc. The Board may also take the initiative and put up some question for discussion, or the industrial members may stress the urgency of some matter with the Government representatives.

The proceedings and papers of the Board are private, but no doubt members discuss the topics on the agenda with their immediate contacts, except where such matters are highly confidential. Press notices are issued on changes in Board membership, but not on its meetings. There are some links with official committees through the civil servants on the Board, but there is no specific co-ordination with other advisory bodies.

The proceedings of the Board are carried on in an informal atmosphere. Typical topics on the agenda include the free trade area, prices, exports, and the general economic situation. Many topics are long-standing ones and occur on almost every agenda.

The Board is, in practice, a major consultative committee for economic policy matters: it does not direct or supervise the "planning" of the economy in any sense. Through the Board senior officials are able to test outside reactions to possible policies at an early stage in their formation. This is practicable owing to the confidential nature of the procedure and the small size of the Board. The outside members have no preliminary discussion with the organisations they represent on the specific matters to be discussed and are not briefed in any way. This consultation can be done more effectively through a small committee than through *ad hoc* contacts: the formal agenda ensures that matters are treated in a businesslike manner. Discussion can be held without committing either the groups represented or the Government to any particular attitude.

The Board is more personal and less representative, and works more privately, than the National Production Advisory Council on Industry, or the National Joint Advisory Council. It provides

regular opportunities for frank discussions between senior civil servants and leading members of both sides of industry on national economic problems and policies.

### NATIONAL JOINT ADVISORY COUNCIL

(Ministry of Labour)

The National Joint Advisory Council (NJAC) was set up in October 1939, but it first achieved great prominence after Mr. Bevin became Minister of Labour in 1940. During the war the transfers of labour and other manpower policies were so drastic that it was essential to get the advice of both sides of industry before any action was taken. Thus the Council arose directly out of the war situation: it had no predecessors before 1939. Though labour and manpower problems have now changed there has been no alteration in the basic structure and functions of the NJAC, except that representatives of the nationalised industries now sit.<sup>4</sup>

The terms of reference of the NJAC are very wide: "to advise the Government on matters in which employers and workpeople have a common interest." In fact the Council confines itself to what are generally recognised as "labour matters"—roughly, those matters which fall within the province of the Ministry of Labour. There is of course some tendency to overlap with the National Production Advisory Council on Industry, since the economic situation is crucial for both Councils. There is some common membership with the NPACI and difficulties are minimised by informal co-ordination. The Council covers the whole range of employment, in agriculture and service industries as well as manufacturing.

#### *Membership*

There are now three main components of the Council—the representatives of the British Employers' Confederation, those of the Trades Union Congress, and those of the nationalised industries. Originally the Council consisted of fifteen BEC and fifteen TUC representatives. Representatives of nationalised industries first sat in 1949.

The British Employers' Confederation now nominates seventeen members of the Council. At present five of these are officials of employers' associations—Sir George Pollock of the BEC and four

<sup>4</sup> See Ministry of Labour, *Report for the years 1939-1946*, p. 318.

from constituent associations. The rest are businessmen: but these have all long taken part in the work of the BEC or employers' organisations. One of the employers' representatives is an official of the National Farmers' Union. The President of the BEC normally acts as spokesman for the employers' group.

Since 1946 the Trades Union Congress has been represented by a similar number of members. Apart from Sir Vincent Tewson, General Secretary of the TUC, these are always union officials, usually presidents or general secretaries of their unions, and they are all members of the General Council of the TUC. Sir Thomas Williamson usually acts as the main spokesman for the trade union group. Unions not affiliated to the TUC are not represented on the Council, though some (such as NALGO) do maintain liaison with the TUC. It is not often that non-industrial matters which might affect such unions come before the NJAC.

The nationalised industries are represented on the NJAC by six members. This does not permit a representative from each Corporation, but in fact most types of industry are covered. There is a system of co-ordination between the Corporations (organised through an official of the British Transport Commission) and Sir John Benstead of the Commission acts as the main spokesman for the group.

There are no strict rules about attendance at meetings, and all groups may bring substitutes or additional representatives without objection if they have special knowledge of the subject matter. The general attendance is good—say twenty-five or so out of the maximum of forty non-official members. There is no fixed period of appointment and members usually serve until they retire; thus in spite of the flexibility of the membership arrangements there has in fact been great continuity in the composition of the Council.

The Ministry of Labour is represented by the Minister as chairman; the Parliamentary Secretary; the Permanent Secretary and one or more Deputy Secretaries; the Under Secretary of the Industrial Relations Department; and on occasion one or two other officials. The secretary is an Assistant Principal, who is mainly concerned with making arrangements and keeping records. There are also representatives of other departments. Occasionally other Ministers attend—rarely, the Chancellor of the Exchequer—when matters of special interest to them are to be discussed. A representative of the Treasury Information Division attends, and ex-



pounds the Treasury Economic Bulletin. There are usually representatives of the Ministry of Aviation and of the Board of Trade present. An official of the Ministry of Education attends when such matters as apprenticeship are to be discussed.

### *Meetings and methods*

The Council meets quarterly, on the fourth Wednesday in January, April, July, and October. The agenda is decided by the Ministry of Labour and circulated beforehand. Members may ask for items to be put on the agenda, but in practice do not often do so—the subjects of discussion are usually wide enough for any points to be raised. Papers put before the meeting are usually official ones drawn up in the Ministry, but it is possible for other groups to put them forward.

There is also the Joint Consultative Committee, which is in effect an executive committee of the full Council. This has seven members from the BEC, seven from the TUC, and two from the nationalised industries. It meets as required and sits as a "clearing-house" for business too detailed to be taken by the Council. Its work is reported to the main Council. Special subjects are sometimes dealt with by sub-committees. These are set up *ad hoc* and work independently on particular problems. This work normally culminates in an agreed report on the subject, which is put before the main Council and published.

Press notices are issued after the quarterly meetings of the National Joint Advisory Council, giving summaries of the main topics discussed. There is no press conference, as with the NPACI. The notices issued run to one, two or three pages and deal mainly with ministerial statements and the decisions of the Council. Views expressed are mentioned only very briefly and as group statements—for example, "On behalf of the TUC it was stated . . .", "For the Nationalised Industries it was stated . . .", and "The BEC also indicated . . .". Reports published by the NJAC are usually on specific topics (the work of sub-committees) and there are no general annual reports. There is a note on the Council's activities in the annual Ministry of Labour report.

The main work of the Council centres on the general state of the economy; and for this topic the Treasury Economic Bulletin provides a basis for discussion. Matters which have been prominent in recent years include automation and its possible con-

sequences; the more efficient use of manpower; the report of the Franks Committee; the payment of wages by cheque; and the effect of cuts in defence on manpower. There was also discussion of the "contract of service" proposal.

The National Joint Advisory Council is mainly a forum for general discussion. The accomplishments of sub-committees in agreed reports and other definite understandings reached on the Council are of considerable importance; but the less tangible benefits from the mere existence of a respected top-level body with high prestige, and from the informal contacts which it creates, are also of consequence.

## CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE FOR INDUSTRY

(Board of Trade)

The Consultative Committee for Industry (CCI) was established by the Board of Trade early in 1947, for consultation with industry on the Geneva tariff negotiations, and had no direct predecessors in its field of interest. It arose out of the thorough examination of trade policy necessary for the negotiations which led up to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. At the Ottawa Conference of 1934 the United Kingdom delegation had included representatives of industry; in 1947, however, there was no strong pressure for this from the Federation of British Industries or the Trades Union Congress, and since the other delegations (especially the American) were to consist entirely of officials, the same principle was adopted by the United Kingdom. Instead, therefore, consultation in the United Kingdom was necessary, and the Consultative Committee was set up for this purpose.<sup>8</sup>

The Committee is concerned with Britain's overseas trade, and may deal with any topic within the Board of Trade's responsibilities in this field. It does not deal with the Board's responsibilities for domestic industry. There are no formal terms of reference.

So far the main subjects of discussion have been: various GATT negotiations, the Organisation for European Economic Co-operation, Commonwealth conferences (e.g. Ottawa 1951), and the proposed European free trade area. The CCI is concerned with broad objectives and tactics—another (temporary) com-

<sup>8</sup> See article on the CCI in the *Board of Trade Journal*, 1 January 1960, p. 3.

mittee under Sir William Palmer deals with details of European trade proposals.

### *Membership*

There is no fixed individual membership of the Committee. The chairman is the President of the Board of Trade. The main top-level national organisations in productive industry are invited to send representatives. Transport, distribution and trading organisations as such are not represented, nor are nationalised concerns. The bodies regularly invited are: the Federation of British Industries; the National Union of Manufacturers; the Association of British Chambers of Commerce; the Trades Union Congress; the National Farmers' Union; the Co-operative Union Ltd.; and the British Trawlers Federation. Organisations may send as many representatives as they choose—there are often five or six from the FBI and two or three from the other bodies. Sometimes organisations send none, if a particular agenda does not concern them.

Other departments besides the Board of Trade may send representatives if they are interested—the Ministry of Agriculture, Treasury, and Customs and Excise sometimes do. Other Ministers (recently the Paymaster-General, for example) occasionally attend. About thirty members are usually present at any meeting, about one-third being civil servants. Organisations may send anyone they choose, and do vary their representation according to the subject to be discussed; but in fact there is considerable continuity of representation. The industrial organisations always include at least one permanent official besides businessmen. The trade unionists are usually from the TUC Economic Committee. Organisations usually try to send high-level trading experts. It is the practice for representatives to make it clear when minorities within their organisations (e.g. the paper industry on the free trade area) do not support the general line they are taking.

### *Meetings and methods*

Meetings are held about four or five times a year, and are called as required by the Board of Trade. Occasionally there is discussion at one meeting about the next, but meetings are not fixed in advance. The agenda is prepared by the Board of Trade, but other topics are occasionally raised under "any other business". There is initiative from both sides; but nevertheless discussion is

mainly determined by prospective Government activities. No reports are prepared, and no formal decisions are made at meetings. Minutes are taken but not published; on rare occasions there is a brief Press release after a meeting.

Sub-committees are occasionally set up. There was one on the European Recovery Programme in 1948-49. After the report of a Committee on Bilateral Trade Negotiations was published in 1953, a sub-committee of the CCI was set up to deal with this subject.

The first main subject to be discussed by the CCI was the policy to be pursued in the negotiations for the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at Geneva in 1947 and in the first round of tariff negotiations. There was then a lull until 1948, when industry became very anxious to be consulted about the European Recovery Programme; and the ERP Sub-committee was the main centre of activity for a year or two. In 1949 came the second round of GATT tariff negotiations at Annecy, and there was a third round at Torquay at the end of 1950. Consultation about various GATT matters has continued throughout the life of the Committee. There have also been recurrent discussions of developments in OEEC negotiations, and Commonwealth matters. In 1958 the work of the Committee was concerned almost entirely with the proposed European free trade area. The Committee became the main channel for regular consultation with industrial organisations about this project.

The CCI is primarily a forum for face-to-face discussion about prospective Government action in its field. It ensures that there is machinery in existence for ready consultation; views can be obtained at fairly short notice, and there is no recurrent problem about whom to consult on various topics. The absence of decisions leaves the Government very free to accept or disregard advice as it chooses; but the CCI machinery enables it to be sure what the advice of industrial organisations is.

### ENGINEERING ADVISORY COUNCIL

(Board of Trade)

The Engineering Advisory Council (EAC) was set up at the Ministry of Supply in 1948\* when there was considerable pressure from the trade unions for a Government-run engineering industry, and for a body with executive responsibilities. Lord

\* See article on this Council in the *Board of Trade Journal*, 4 December 1959, p. 897.

Wilmot, the Minister, hoped that by setting up the Advisory Council, the Government would be able at least to influence the industry, and at the same time to learn what it thought about reconstruction problems.

The structure of the Council has not changed since it was established, although in July 1955 it came under the auspices of the Board of Trade when responsibility for the engineering industry was transferred to the Board. The terms of reference of the Council are:

to provide for the President of the Board of Trade, in the discharge of his responsibilities for the engineering industries, a means of consultation with employers and workers in the industry on matters of general concern in the engineering field. Matters normally handled by the joint organisations of employers and trade unions in connection with wages and conditions of employment are excluded.

The Council originally dealt with all branches of engineering (including vehicles) except shipbuilding, hardware and similar products; but since electronics and aircraft remain the responsibility of the Ministry of Aviation (formerly Supply), the Council has now less concern with those industries. The EAC is concerned with the problems of the engineering industry as a whole, and it is unusual for it to be involved with the problems of a particular branch of it.

Within this field, the Council confines itself as far as possible to general problems. Some more detailed matters are dealt with by other committees, such as the Machine Tool Advisory Council and the National Advisory Council for the Motor Manufacturing Industry. Special topics may be taken up, however, if necessary: for example, certain problems of the machine tool industry were considered by the EAC, and it has dealt with the question of standards for screw threads.

### *Membership*

There are twenty-two members of the Council, in addition to the chairman (the President of the Board of Trade) and other official representatives. Eleven members represent the managerial side and eleven the trade unions. They are appointed as individuals and in theory do not represent organisations: but this convention has more reality on the employers' side than the unions'. The

appointments made by the President attempt to cover most sections of the industry, but no firm or trade association has the right to nominate, though their suggestions may be sought informally. The appointments on the trade union side are made on the suggestion of the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions, and sometimes seem to be *ex officio*—when a union office-holder retires or is not re-elected, his successor is nominated and appointed. But the smaller unions concerned with engineering cannot be sure of permanent representation.

All the employers' representatives are leading industrialists. The President of the Engineering Industries Association (which comprises small firms) has no position in any of the Association's companies. One member is from the steel industry though the Council is not directly concerned with steel production. The trade unionists are all union officials.

Most appointments have been made for an indefinite period; in practice members resigned when they retired or left their post in the industry. Fixed periods of appointment are now becoming the practice. There has been considerable continuity of membership—some members have served since the inception of the Council.

In addition to the President in the chair, the Board of Trade is normally represented by the Parliamentary Secretary, the Second Secretary (Production), the Under Secretary from the Engineering Industries Division, the secretary to the Council, and others who may have an interest in the discussion. There are often officials from the Ministries of Supply and Education; on some rare occasions these Ministers have attended. Civil servants from the Ministry of Labour usually attend; and often also there are representatives from the Ministry of Agriculture and the Admiralty which are (or were) production departments for branches of engineering. A member of the Iron and Steel Board always attends. The average attendance is about thirty-five.

#### *Meetings and methods*

Meetings are held quarterly in the normal course, but special ones may be held—one year there were three extra on the free trade area. They are called by the Board of Trade, which fixes the agenda, though there may be informal consultation with the organisations and with other departments.

Since members sit as individuals and no decisions are taken by the Council, neither associations nor unions are committed by what occurs, and they do not hold formal discussions about the line to take. New members are not always from the same organisation or exactly the same section of the industry as retiring ones; but nevertheless the persons chosen have the confidence of the employers and their trade associations or of the trade unions.

After meetings the secretariat produces a summary of what was said, about three or four pages in length. This does not mention members by name, but refers to "Trades Union members", "an employer member" and so on. About 1,650 copies of this are duplicated and distributed "within the Engineering Industry" through the organisations—1,400 through the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions and 250 through the Federation of British Industries. Full minutes are also made in the normal way, but are confidential.

Papers for the Council are usually prepared by the secretariat in the Board of Trade. Occasionally there are papers from the trade unions, and other departments sometimes contribute papers—for example, the Ministry of Education on technical education. An account of the activities of the Council between 1955 and 1958 is given in Special Study III.

The Council has very high prestige in the engineering industry, which is due to the personal standing of its members rather than to any system of representation. It is useful to have a top-level body not concerned with wage bargaining where leading trade unionists can participate in general discussions with Ministers and industrialists. This improves the understanding among unionists of the problems of the management of the industry, and also makes industrialists and officials explain and defend their policies. The circulation of summaries shows that some effort is made to use the prestige of the Council for diffusing understanding of general issues widely through the industry.

#### AGRICULTURAL IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL FOR ENGLAND AND WALES

(Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food)

The Agricultural Improvement Council for England and Wales, and the comparable Council for Scotland, were set up in 1941.

The chairman is an ex-member of the English Improvement Council.

The terms of reference have been changed and enlarged since the Council was originally set up. They now are:

To keep under review the progress of research with a view to ensuring that promising results are applied as rapidly as possible to the problems of agriculture and horticulture, and that these and any other new technical methods are incorporated in ordinary commercial practice; to advise from time to time concerning agricultural and horticultural problems which appear to require scientific investigation; and to advise generally as to the lines on which a policy designed to raise the technical standard of agricultural and horticultural production can best be implemented.

This change in the terms of reference reflects the change of emphasis in the work of the Council from innovating a system to making use of services that already exist.

### *Membership*

The eighteen members of the Improvement Council are appointed by the Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food from among leading scientists and practical agriculturists and horticulturists. Some names, no doubt, suggest themselves; others are put forward by the department including its regional organisation.

Members are appointed in a personal capacity but in making his appointments the Minister tries to ensure that all types of agricultural and horticultural interests are represented. Thus the Council includes farmers and horticulturists, together with the president of the National Farmers' Union and the general secretary of the National Union of Agricultural Workers; land owners and land agents are also represented; a director of an agricultural station and the director of a research station are both members; and so is the secretary of the Agricultural Research Council. The four academic members of the Council include a professor of genetics and a professor of veterinary preventive medicine. A geographical balance is not aimed at. There are no representatives of smallholders on the Council because smallholders have a separate Council of their own—the Smallholdings Advisory Council. In June 1953 representatives of estate management were



appointed to the Council and the physical problems of estate management became one of the topics within its terms of reference.

The chairman of the Council is the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. The vice-chairman is chosen from among the other members of the Council. The secretariat is provided by the Ministry of Agriculture, and the present secretary is the Senior Education and Advisory Officer (Science) of the National Agricultural Advisory Service.

In addition to the members of the Council there are usually a number of civil servants in attendance. These include the Chief Scientific Adviser (Agriculture), the Director, the three Senior Education and Advisory Officers of the National Agricultural Advisory Service and the Director of the Agricultural Land Service, the Deputy Secretary, the Under Secretary and the Assistant Secretary in the Ministry dealing with this branch of work, and also any other officials of the Ministry of Agriculture whose presence may be helpful. At most meetings there are usually about thirty people present, but at harvest time there is occasionally a lesser attendance.

The members are appointed for a term of three years when the Council is re-constituted as a whole. Usually most of them are re-appointed but there are a few new members each time.

### *Methods of work*

The Council now meets quarterly and there are also opportunities for members to visit the Ministry's experimental centres. Papers for discussion are usually presented by the Ministry officials. The Council has also to consider the reports of the sub-committees. There is an exchange of papers and other documents between the secretariats of the English and Scottish Councils.

### *Committees*

Much of the work of the Council is done through its seven committees. Four of these have sub-committees or working parties. The chairmen of the committees are all members of the Council, but most of the members of the committees are not. The secretaries of the committees and sub-committees are frequently called conveners. They are technical secretaries, in almost every case being members of the National Agricultural Advisory

The chairman is an ex-member of the English Improvement Council.

The terms of reference have been changed and enlarged since the Council was originally set up. They now are:

To keep under review the progress of research with a view to ensuring that promising results are applied as rapidly as possible to the problems of agriculture and horticulture, and that these and any other new technical methods are incorporated in ordinary commercial practice; to advise from time to time concerning agricultural and horticultural problems which appear to require scientific investigation; and to advise generally as to the lines on which a policy designed to raise the technical standard of agricultural and horticultural production can best be implemented.

This change in the terms of reference reflects the change of emphasis in the work of the Council from innovating a system to making use of services that already exist.

### *Membership*

The eighteen members of the Improvement Council are appointed by the Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food from among leading scientists and practical agriculturists and horticulturists. Some names, no doubt, suggest themselves; others are put forward by the department including its regional organisation.

Members are appointed in a personal capacity but in making his appointments the Minister tries to ensure that all types of agricultural and horticultural interests are represented. Thus the Council includes farmers and horticulturists, together with the president of the National Farmers' Union and the general secretary of the National Union of Agricultural Workers; land owners and land agents are also represented; a director of an agricultural station and the director of a research station are both members; and so is the secretary of the Agricultural Research Council. The four academic members of the Council include a professor of genetics and a professor of veterinary preventive medicine. A geographical balance is not aimed at. There are no representatives of smallholders on the Council because smallholders have a separate Council of their own—the Smallholdings Advisory Council. In June 1953 representatives of estate management were

financing of university research and the resources devoted to research and development. The Council may initiate discussions of problems, as well as deal with matters put to it by the Government. The Council deals with all matters concerning the natural sciences, pure and applied, including medicine, agricultural research and so on. It is not concerned with the social sciences.

### *Membership*

The Council has fifteen members at present: the number varies slightly from time to time. About half the membership consists of independent scientists, the rest being appointed virtually *ex officio*. The independent members at present include an officer of the Royal Society, a university professor, a principal of a College of Advanced Technology, a representative of Atomic Energy, and two industrial scientists. The chairman (Sir Alexander Todd) and deputy chairman (Sir Solly Zuckerman) are also independent scientists.

The members who hold official positions are the chairman of the Defence Research Policy Committee; the secretaries of the Medical Research Council, the Agricultural Research Council, and the DSIR; the Director-General of the Nature Conservancy; the chairman of the University Grants Committee; and a Third Secretary of the Treasury. All the members of the Council are scientists, with the exception of the Treasury representative.

All members are appointed by the Minister for Science. They are usually appointed for a period of three years and it is not usual to ask them to serve for a second term of office. This brings, in the long run, a greater variety of scientists into the work of the Council, thus enabling fresh ideas to be expressed and enhancing the Council's prestige by demonstrating that it is not a narrow clique. There is an attempt to maintain a balance between disciplines, and this is borne in mind in the appointment of independent members. Representatives of interested Ministries or (rarely) other scientists attend if they have a particular contribution. Normally all these deputies remain only for the item which concerns them, not for the whole meeting.

### *Committees*

There are at present three standing committees set up by the Council itself: (i) Scientific Manpower, (ii) Scientific Libraries and Technical Information, (iii) Overseas Scientific Relations. The

Service. In addition to their secretarial duties they guide the work of the committees. Subjects for discussion may be suggested by members of the Council, or its committees; papers are generally prepared and presented by officials. Each committee of the Council reports at one of the Council meetings. As there are six principal committees each committee reports once in every eighteen months. In the meantime, the minutes are sent to the Council for information. The recommendations of the Council are expressed in the minutes, and are not the subject of separate documents.

The Council enjoys the co-operation of farming interests and the Ministry's advisory services in bringing to its attention problems requiring research and in implementing and making known the results of research. The proposals of the Council carry great weight; where the expenditure of public money is involved there are the usual limitations but its recommendations are usually implemented.

### ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SCIENTIFIC POLICY

(Office of the Minister for Science)

This Council was set up in January 1947, and held its first meeting in March of that year. Its appointment coincided with the establishment of the Ministry of Defence and its Defence Research Policy Committee. This constituted a division between civil and defence research, for hitherto both had been dealt with by the Scientific Advisory Committee to the Cabinet (set up in 1940). To minimise the effects of this division Sir Henry Tizard was appointed chairman of both the Council and the Defence Research Policy Committee. The chairman of the Committee now provides a link between the twin bodies.

The terms of reference remain as originally stated in 1947:

To advise the Lord President of the Council<sup>a</sup> in the exercise of his responsibility for the formulation and execution of Government scientific policy.

In practice the Council has kept under continuous review such questions as the organisation of Government scientific research, national scientific manpower, scientific libraries, and overseas scientific relations, as well as dealing from time to time with other important topics and institutions such as space research, the

<sup>a</sup> Now the Minister for Science.

Reports and papers are normally prepared by the secretariat, though occasionally members of the Council contribute in writing. The annual report is published; and also occasional reports on particular subjects, notably scientific manpower. These reports are discussions of certain important topics; they are written to educate the public, and to convey information not available elsewhere. The reports to the Minister for Science are confidential but circulate fairly widely in Government circles.

There is co-ordination with the Defence Research Policy Committee. Sir Frederick Brundrett serves on both bodies and there is consultation between the civil servants concerned. There are no other formal established links, though in recent years the chairman or the deputy chairman has normally been a member of the Scientific Advisory Council of the Ministry of Supply. The Council has only a small secretariat, in the office of the Lord Privy Seal and Minister for Science.

The Council deals largely with certain standing problems; but in addition it may receive requests for advice from the Government through the Lord President, and it may (itself or in a committee) bring up problems on its own initiative. The question of building research was referred to it; and the establishment of national scientific lending and reference libraries are matters which it has pursued on its own initiative.

The Council exists mainly to keep watch on certain permanent problems. It is primarily an expert committee, but it is not a specialist committee; the members do not make use of their particular specialist knowledge and skill, but rather use their experience and understanding of the scientific world in general. It therefore combines the administrators of national scientific institutions with a selection of independent scientists from industry and the universities. In this way it acquires both immediate experience of organisational problems, and scientific prestige from leading authorities who serve in turn on it. The success of the Council is marked by the attention which its reports receive.

#### ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL DEVELOPMENT

(Ministry of Aviation, formerly Supply)

The Council, which is usually known as the Scientific Advisory Council (SAC), was formed at the end of 1939 and first met in

chairman of each committee is appointed by the Council from among its own members, and other members also serve. The rest of the committee consists of outside specialists. The Committee on Scientific Manpower covers one of the most important aspects of the Council's work. Its chairman is the deputy-chairman of the Council, and it consists, roughly, half of representatives of departments (the Treasury, the Ministry of Education, the Central Statistical Office) and half of independents. In practice this permanent Committee is a nucleus to which many other experts, representatives of professional bodies, etc., are added as various topics in the field are taken up. The Council has also set up a technical sub-committee under the chairmanship of the Director of the Central Statistical Office to assist with the preparation of reports and statistics. The members of this sub-committee are representatives of the Government departments interested. The Committee on Scientific Libraries and Technical Information has as its chairman a member of the Council, and includes a few officials and a number of independent specialists. It sets up special sub-committees for particular problems and there is a permanent technical sub-committee. Sir Alexander Todd is himself chairman of the Committee on Overseas Scientific Relations. This is a small committee of about six people, including representatives of the Foreign Office, the Treasury, the Royal Society and other bodies. One of its functions is to advise on relations with developing international organisations, such as the NATO and OEEC Scientific Committees. The main weight of the work of the Council is carried by these committees, but the Council does deal with some matters itself. From time to time *ad hoc* committees have been set up—for instance on tropical agriculture, on industrial activity and on radioactive substances. All committees may invite outsiders to meetings.

#### *Meetings and methods*

The Council meets about six times a year: at least once a quarter, and as many times in addition as seems necessary. It considers draft reports and memoranda from its committees and deals with general topics which it has not referred to its committees. Its advice to Her Majesty's Government takes the form of confidential reports and memoranda to the Minister for Science; and this is supplemented orally by the Chairman.

industry and from research associations. Occasionally scientists from other departments serve in their personal capacity. There are no representatives from outside organisations.

The Council has fourteen independent members. Twelve of these are university professors or ex-professors; one is Director of Research in a chemical firm, and one is a member of the Atomic Energy Authority. Four members are mainly concerned with some aspect of chemistry, four with physics; two are mathematicians and two engineers; and there are an anatomist and a bio-chemist. There has been a preponderance of chemists on the Council, since their subject was of major concern, but this is now declining. One member is also a member of the Advisory Council on Scientific Policy. Members of the Council serve only for three years at a time. They must then retire for one year.

There are also official representatives at the meetings of the Council—seven in all. Two are Ministry of Aviation officials: the Chief Scientist and the Director-General of Scientific Research (Munitions), who is responsible for executive action on recommendations made by the Council. There are also leading scientific civil servants from the Admiralty, the Air Ministry, the War Office, the DSIR, and the Home Office. The departmental representatives are not voting members of the Council. The secretary and assistant secretary are provided by the Ministry of Aviation.

Under the main Council there are five boards, each concerned with a part of the field of research. These boards each divide their responsibility for detailed work between committees, frequently on a subject basis. These committees are in close touch with the research projects, and it is on the committees that most of the detailed scientific work of the SAC takes place. The membership of the boards and committees is limited to twelve, including the chairman, though there is some flexibility in the case of committees. Some committees consist merely of three or four members. Sub-committees and panels are occasionally set up by committees.

Members and chairmen may serve for six years (two terms); it is then compulsory to stand down for a year. The chairmen of the committees mostly serve on the parent board. It is unusual for either the Council itself or the boards to have members who are not serving or have not served on any committee. The chairmen

January 1940. There was before the war a civilian Director of Scientific Research in the War Office; the research establishments were, however, controlled by Army officers, who did not always appreciate the need of the scientists for outside contacts. The Director of Scientific Research obtained agreement, about 1938, to the principle of an Advisory Council. No action had been taken when, in 1939, the Ministry of Supply was formed and took over the Directorate of Scientific Research and the research establishments; the principle was, however, endorsed by the new Ministry, and the SAC was set up with the purpose of providing contact between scientists in the Ministry and the outside scientific world.

The Council retains the terms of reference given to it in 1939. They are:

- (i) To consider and initiate new proposals for research and development and to review research and development in progress in Ministry of Supply Establishments in relation to the most recent advances in scientific knowledge.
- (ii) To advise on scientific and technical problems referred to them.
- (iii) To make recommendations regarding the most effective use of scientific personnel for research and development.
- (iv) To report to the Minister of Supply.

The SAC was set up to deal with problems concerning Army weapons and equipment but in practice it advises also on problems in radar and communications for all Services and, jointly with the Aeronautical Research Council, in guided weapons. The Aeronautical Research Council, established long before the SAC, deals with Air Force and allied matters, and purely metallurgical problems are dealt with by the Metallurgical Research Council, which works with the Admiralty as well as the Ministry of Aviation. There are now more common problems (e.g. explosives, small guns, guided weapons) with the ARC, and collaboration is hence becoming closer. There is also an Advisory Board on non-metallic materials. All these bodies are comparable in importance to the SAC and many of the arrangements described here apply also to them.

### *Membership*

All the non-departmental members of the Council serve as individuals. They are drawn mostly from the universities, from



lems with non-members, but this is strictly governed by security considerations, and no general discussion is possible. The Council is encouraged to suggest new lines of research and to point out inadequacies in the existing programme, and not to confine itself to comments and advice on current projects.

The Council reports directly to the Minister (para. iv in terms of reference) and can be independent of all Ministry officials. The chairman is appointed by the Minister and has direct access to him. This principle, and the way the various bodies are constituted, ensure that the Council is genuinely independent.

In the early years, and right through the war, the Council was able to give great help to the research in a technical sense—they could provide knowledge and constructive advice directly relevant to the matters being investigated. Since the war, however, there have been great improvements on the scientific side of the civil service, the general standard in research establishments has risen, and their work has become more and more specialised. Hence outsiders are able to give less technical help on particular lines: their work consists rather of general guidance, and assistance with basic research.

The Council is entirely concerned with expert advice, and the representation of interests is only significant in the balancing of the various sciences on the Council and lesser bodies. The Council does not at any point have to resolve any financial problems or deal with Service or inter-Service questions of a political nature, although it may, and does, put forward scientific considerations which may affect decisions on such problems. It has, however, several interesting and unusual arrangements—in particular the strict and severe arrangements for the rotation of membership; the payment of fees to members; and the secrecy made necessary by security requirements.

### CENTRAL HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

(Ministry of Housing and Local Government)

The Central Housing Advisory Committee was set up in November 1935, under the provisions of the Housing Act of that year. The Committee had specific terms of reference, but could also make representations to the Minister on any questions of general housing concern. The Minister took the chair and there

of boards often serve on the Council itself, but since the Council has a compulsory three-year term and the boards only a six-year limit, this is not always possible. Chairmen of boards who are not on the Council may occasionally attend as visitors when they can make a special contribution. There is no general difficulty in finding scientists willing to serve; there have been rare refusals on pacifist grounds, or on account of heavy commitments.

Members of the Council, boards and committees receive expenses and a fee for each meeting they attend.

### *Meetings and methods*

The Council itself meets seven or eight times a year—monthly from October to April or May. During the summer two visits by the Council to research establishments are organised. It considers any major problems of research and development brought to it by the Chief Scientist or its Executive Officer, the allocation of staff and recruitment, and the reports of the boards. In accordance with its fourth term of reference it presents to the Minister an annual report on its work, in addition to any advice it may offer during the year on major problems. The chairman always visits the Minister to present and discuss such reports. Occasionally (about once every two years) the Minister attends Council meetings.

Committees usually meet four or five times a year. At least one meeting is held at the relevant research establishment, and is combined with a tour of inspection. Reports from sub-committees and panels are considered. It is now the practice to minimise the drafting of formal reports, and to use instead the minutes of the meeting with an oral report from the chairman or other member. In addition the committee members are encouraged to regard themselves as individual consultants, and they visit the research establishments separately from time to time.

The proceedings of the Council, its boards and committees, are concerned with matters which affect national security and are thus classified according to their content—in the main they are classified as "secret" papers. In addition they are confidential to the members. There is an occasional press release on the membership of the main Council, but on nothing else. The annual report is not published, nor is anything else about the work of the Council. Occasionally committees can obtain permission to discuss prob-

The Committee has thirty members excluding the chairman and vice-chairman. No geographical balance is aimed at, but the Minister sees that the Committee is not overweighted by one type of expert. The members can be divided into three very rough categories: those concerned with (a) supplying houses (sixteen members at present), (b) the occupiers of houses (eight), and (c) the technique of building houses (six). The suppliers include local authority councillors and officials and representatives of building societies. Those concerned with the consumers' interests are drawn from various social service organisations, such as the WVS, university teachers, and trade unionists. The technicians are building contractors, architects and so on. Tenants or occupiers of houses are not directly represented, since there is no satisfactory organisation of tenants—those that exist tend to be ephemeral or politically inspired. Members of both Houses of Parliament have served on the Committee and this has led to no difficulties.

Members of the Committee are appointed for a period of three years. They are frequently appointed for a second term, but it is less common to re-appoint for a third or fourth term. The Minister himself is the chairman and almost always attends. The Parliamentary Secretary is vice-chairman, and he, the Permanent Secretary and one or two other officials attend as required. The secretary of the Committee is an Assistant Secretary in the Ministry of Housing and Local Government. Other departments are not represented unless a matter of particular interest to them is to be discussed.

### *Meetings*

The Committee meets quarterly. The detailed work is done through sub-committees, which meet much more frequently until they have finished their reports.

The agenda and minutes are prepared and circulated by the secretary in the department. Papers are usually prepared in the department. There is no reason why the Committee members should not submit papers for discussion, but they rarely do so.

### *Sub-committees*

The sub-committees include from seven to nineteen members. There is full power to co-opt, but the usual practice is not to co-opt more than one-third of the members. The chairman of a

were twenty-five other members drawn from a wide field. The Committee met only four times between 1935 and 1937, and most of its work was done through sub-committees, which prepared two reports.

The present Committee largely follows the original lines. Having been created by the Housing Act of 1935, the Committee reappeared in the Consolidating Acts of 1936 and 1957. Its functions, set out in Section 143 of the latter Act, are as follows:

- (1) The Minister shall appoint a committee, to be called the Central Housing Advisory Committee, for the purpose of:
  - (a) advising the Minister on any matter, relating to a temporary increase of the permitted number of persons in relation to overcrowding, as respects which he is required by section seventy-nine of this Act to consult the Committee;
  - (b) advising the Housing Management Commissions constituted under Part V of this Act on any matter as respects which such Commissions are required to consult the Committee;
  - (c) advising the Minister on any question which may be referred by him to the Committee with respect to any other matter arising in connection with the execution of the enactments relating to housing;
  - (d) considering the operation of the enactments relating to housing and making to the Minister such representations with respect to matters of general concern arising in connection with the execution of those enactments as the Committee think desirable.

So far as the first function is concerned, the powers concerning overcrowding are quiescent, and as for the second function, no Housing Commission has been set up. Statutory instruments<sup>9</sup> provide that the Committee shall not have more than thirty members, and that each person holds office for two years after the 30 September following his appointment. The 1935 Order also provides that the Minister shall be chairman and the Parliamentary Secretary vice-chairman and that the quorum shall be five. Otherwise the Committee is free to regulate its own procedure.

### *Membership*

Committee members are chosen by the Minister, but he makes informal enquiries about possible members; they are not in any way representatives of any organisation to which they may belong.

<sup>9</sup> S.R. & O. 1935, No. 1115, and S.R. & O. 1945, No. 1240.

them in public. The influence of the Committee on the Minister varies: some Ministers are more willing to take advice than others, and there are always alternative sources of expert knowledge—the Ministry's expert staff, and direct consultation with independent authorities.

### NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE TRAINING AND SUPPLY OF TEACHERS

(Ministry of Education)

The National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers was set up in 1949. It traces its origin to the McNair Report of 1944 on the Training of Teachers;<sup>10</sup> but the present Council is very different from the Central Training Council proposed by the report. This proposed a small committee of three to five members, which would advise the President of the Board of Education on integrating by areas the education and training of teachers, either by means of university schools of education or by means of joint boards. An Interim Committee for Teachers for England was created early in 1947 to assist the Ministry of Education in setting up the area training organisations (the joint boards of the McNair Report). This Committee was unlike the Council recommended by the report, however; it was strictly advisory, meeting under the chairmanship of the Parliamentary Secretary; and it consisted of representatives of local education authorities, and of teachers in schools and also in training colleges and departments. A similar Interim Committee was created for Wales.

In 1948 preparations were made to set up the National Advisory Council.<sup>11</sup> By June 1949 all the area training organisations had been formed and the Council itself was set up, covering both England and Wales. The functions of the Council are to keep under review national policy on:

- (a) the training and conditions of qualification of teachers;
- (b) the supply and distribution of teachers in ways best calculated to meet the needs of the schools or other educational establishments,

The Council is not concerned with teachers' superannuation or

<sup>10</sup> McNair Report, Ch. 4, paras. 155-96.

<sup>11</sup> See *Education in 1948*, Cmd. 7724, Ch. III, para. 5, p. 57.

sub-committee is always a member of the main Committee. The secretary is always an official of the department, but may be an administrative officer or a technical officer; in some cases joint secretaries, one administrative and one technical, have been appointed. The topics studied by the sub-committees range very widely, and have included the management of municipal housing estates, rural housing, design, gardens, care of fittings and equipment, and unsatisfactory tenants.

The sub-committees do not undertake formal research. They have sometimes considered using the Social Survey, but have not yet done so. The normal procedure is for the sub-committee to call for evidence. The organisations submitting evidence may well carry out research for this purpose. The written evidence is then supplemented by oral evidence where the sub-committee desires it, and it may make visits to see development work and so on.

Reports are submitted by the sub-committees to the main Committee for publication to be authorised: in fact all reports have been published—an average of about one a year. From time to time there are minority reports. The technical press always gives a great deal of attention to the reports, but they are written for the general reader and usually attract attention from the general press and public. They are also circulated to local authorities.

### *The Committee itself*

The main Committee does not itself produce reports, though some of its time is taken up in considering those of its sub-committees. Most of its time is spent in round-the-table discussion with the Minister in the chair and various officials present. There are no resolutions and advice is not unanimous—it consists of the personal views of the people present, as modified by the discussion. The Committee is therefore similar in operation to the industrial consultative committees at the Board of Trade and elsewhere. Problems may be raised by the Minister inviting comment on what he proposes to do, or (less commonly) by the Committee taking up matters on its own initiative.

The Committee has influence both on Ministerial policy and on those concerned with housing outside the Government. Its reports have a persuasive force lacking in a Ministry circular because they are drawn up and signed by independent experts, who can defend

public schools. The Headmistress of the North London Collegiate School and the Headmaster of the City of London School have served, however, at various times on the Council among the Minister's personal choices. The National Association of Schoolmasters is not represented.

The Minister is not able to refuse a nomination, though members are appointed in their personal capacity. They are expected to be able to represent the views of their organisations—indeed they are unlikely to be nominated if they cannot—but they do not bind their nominating bodies by what they say at the Council. Substitutes are not allowed to attend.

Members are appointed for three years, at the end of which time the Council is reconstituted. Those appointed in the course of a three-year period are appointed until the next reconstitution. In fact, there is a good deal of continuity of membership. Sir Philip Morris was chairman of the Council from its inception until January 1959. Of the other forty-five members in July 1957, twenty had been members since 1950.

### *Committees*

The constitution requires the Standing Committees to be composed principally of those members representing the organisations most concerned with the Committee's special topic. Thus the Standing Committee on Supply and Distribution, with twenty-eight members, has fourteen local authority representatives (out of sixteen on the Council) and six from the teachers' associations (out of twelve). There are thirty-five members on the Training and Qualifications Committee and nineteen on the Further Education Committee. These Standing Committees also include representatives of the Area Training Organisations, who (on two of the three Committees) are not all members of the Council. The chairmen are normally elected by the Council but Standing Committees elect their own in emergencies. The constitution requires all minutes and relevant documents to be circulated to all members of the Council.

Both the Council and the Standing Committees have power to appoint sub-committees and to appoint or co-opt to the sub-committees persons who are not members of the Council. In 1951, for example, three such sub-committees were set up, one on courses and examinations for teachers of art, one on the

teachers' salaries, or with any other matters which affect their conditions of employment and which, therefore, are discussed directly between teachers and the bodies by which they are employed.<sup>12</sup>

The constitution also deals with the Standing Committees, originally two, one on Training and Qualifications and the other on Supply and Distribution. In 1957 a third was added on Teachers in Establishments of Further Education. The constitution sets out the composition of these Committees, and says that they are to submit recommendations on the subjects referred to them.

### *Membership*

The constitution lays down the organisations which are entitled to nominate members to the Council. In 1958 the members nominated were as follows: four by the County Councils Association; four by the Association of Municipal Corporations; four by the Association of Education Committees; two by the London County Council; two by the Welsh Joint Education Committee; six by the National Union of Teachers; two by the Joint Committee of the Four Secondary Associations; two by the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions; two by the Association of Technical Institutions and the Association of Principals of Technical Institutions acting jointly; five by the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education and including one Principal of a Technical Teacher Training College; six by the representatives of the area training organisations who are members of the Standing Committee on Training and Qualifications, and including one representative of the University Education Board of the University of Wales; two by the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals of Universities and University Colleges. Four representatives of industry and commerce are appointed after consultation with the National Advisory Council on Education for Industry and Commerce. The Minister may also appoint up to four members as he thinks fit.

The Council is therefore composed of forty-nine members excluding the chairman. The chairman is appointed by the Minister, but the vice-chairman is elected by the Council itself. The Headmasters' Conference is not entitled to nominate any members, since the Minister is not concerned with the staffing of

<sup>12</sup> See *Education in 1949*, Cmd. 7957, Ch. III para. 3.



summary of the work of the Council is given each year in the Ministry's annual report. The reports when published usually receive close attention in the educational press and some notice in the daily and weekly press. They are extensively used in Parliamentary debates. A study of action resulting from one of the Council's reports is given in Special Study III.

Education is run by a partnership between the central government, the local authorities, various private organisations and the teachers. The representative character of the Council gives these various organisations the opportunity to present their views and a national policy can be worked out by them. The Minister can and does modify the proposals of the Council; but it is not merely a place for discussion, however useful that in itself may be. The record of its achievements shows that it plays an important role in the planning of the education services.

### CENTRAL HEALTH SERVICES COUNCIL

(Ministry of Health)

The Central Health Services Council (CHSC) was set up by the National Health Service Act, 1946. The intention was to provide a Council to advise the Minister on a very wide range of matters affecting the health services; and an amendment was introduced at the report stage to extend the scope of the Council to include the services provided by local health authorities, such as certain functions under the Mental Deficiency and Public Health Acts.<sup>13</sup> Staff and conditions of service are the concern of Whitley Councils and do not fall within the scope of the Council.

The Council did not have direct predecessors, but there were some earlier Councils appointed under the Ministry of Health Act, 1919. These included the Medical and Allied Services Council, the Local Health Administration Council, the General Health Questions Council, the Cancer Advisory Committee, and so on. But except for committees on tuberculosis and cancer, most of these bodies were inactive by 1939.

#### Membership

The statute<sup>14</sup> lays down detailed rules for the composition of the Council. Certain members are appointed *ex officio*. These are:

<sup>13</sup> C. W. Key, Parliamentary Secretary, *Hansard*, Cols. 1784-5, 22 July 1946.

<sup>14</sup> National Health Service Act, 1946, 1st Schedule, para. 1.

training of teachers for handicapped children, and one on the extension of general training college courses to three years.

### *Meetings and methods*

The constitution provides that the Council shall meet at least twice each year. These meetings usually take place in January and June. Provision is made for additional meetings and there have been several such. The Standing Committees arrange their own meetings, and these are usually twice-yearly. The quorum for the Council and its Standing Committees is one-third.

Unlike many committees, the Council has formed rules and procedure governing the calling of meetings, the circulation of agenda and minutes, voting, quorum, etc. Voting is, in fact, not resorted to, although by the end of a discussion it is pretty clear what the result of a vote would be. The other rules of procedure are closely kept. The secretary of the Council and of two of the Standing Committees is a Principal of the Ministry of Education, with one assistant. The Further Education Standing Committee has two joint secretaries, the other secretary being a member of the Further Education Branch of the Ministry. Papers for discussion are usually prepared in the Ministry.

It is assumed that there will be some discussion between members and their colleagues in the various organisations. Nonetheless, not all representatives of an organisation speak with exactly the same voice. Council meetings have more the character of general discussion than of pitched battles. There is sometimes lively argument and proposals put forward by the Ministry are severely criticised.

The Council does not undertake research. Statistics are supplied as and when required by the Ministry. If additional information were needed the Ministry would obtain it; for example, the Ministry collected material from the local authorities for the sub-committee on specialist teachers.

The work of the sub-committees is almost invariably summed up in a report. The views of the Standing Committees on the other hand are more often expressed in their minutes. The Council itself produces reports, some of which are published. The Council is free to publish what it likes, but is aware of the Minister's views on publication. In some cases unpublished reports have had a limited circulation, for example, to local authorities. A brief

*Standing advisory committees*

Associated with the Central Health Services Council are a number of standing advisory committees. There are also statutory bodies, established under paragraph 3, Section 2 of the National Health Service Act. All nine (medical, dental, pharmaceutical, ophthalmic, nursing, maternity and midwifery, tuberculosis, mental health, and cancer and radiotherapy) were set up in 1948. They vary in size from twenty-seven to fourteen members, and usually consist of a minority of members of the CHSC (appointed by the Minister after consultation with the Council) and a majority of other experts (appointed after consultation with representative organisations), though there is a majority of CHSC members on the Medical Standing Advisory Committee.

The standing advisory committees are in no way sub-committees of the Council, and their advice goes directly to the Minister, though the Minister has undertaken not to act on the advice before the CHSC has had an opportunity to comment on it.

*Other committees*

The Council may appoint committees to study particular questions. In 1958 there were five: the Joint Committee on Classification of Proprietary Preparations, the Committee on Hospital Supplies, the Joint Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine, the Committee on Hospital Laundry Arrangements, and the Committee on the Welfare of Children in Hospital. Usually less than half of the members of these committees are members of the Council. The two Joint Committees are linked with the Scottish Health Services Council; the other three Committees are *ad hoc*. All publish reports making recommendations as a result of their work, and these include the Report of the Committee on General Practice, of 1954. Of the present Council of forty-one members, Lord Cohen of Birkenhead, the chairman, served on three of the Committees mentioned above, one other member on three, and one member on two.

*Meetings and methods*

The Council meets quarterly. The standing advisory committees meet irregularly, but the Pharmaceutical Committee did not meet at all in 1954, 1955 or 1956. The Committees of the

the President of the Royal College of Physicians of London; the President of the Royal College of Surgeons of England; the President of the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists; the Chairman of the Council of the British Medical Association; the President of the General Medical Council; and the Chairman of the Council of the Society of Medical Officers of Health.

The remaining thirty-five members are appointed by the Minister after consultation with the appropriate representative organisations. Fifteen are medical practitioners, of whom two are chosen for their knowledge of mental illness and mental defectiveness; five are experienced in hospital administration, but not medical practitioners; five are experienced in local government, again not medical practitioners; three are dental practitioners; two are experienced in the mental health services; two are registered nurses; one is a certified midwife; and two are registered pharmacists.

The Council is therefore composed of forty-one members, including the chairman and vice-chairman. Some members belong to more than one category, particularly in the local authority-hospital administration categories, and nurses are often midwives. One pharmacist is an alderman, and the former chairman, Sir Frederick Messer, was an alderman of Middlesex County Council and chairman of a Regional Hospital Board for a number of years.

Members are appointed for a three-year term and the terms are so arranged that one-third of the members retire from the Council each year. The *ex officio* members retire when their term of office ends. Members are eligible for re-appointment, and of those originally appointed in 1948 six are still members of the Council. Though the statute requires the Minister to consult with the representative organisations about who is to be appointed, he need not necessarily accept the advice. The common practice is for several names to be submitted and for the Minister to choose from them, though he is not limited to these suggestions in making his appointments. In making the appointments the Minister tries to ensure that there is a fair geographical distribution of members; but a certain preponderance of London members has emerged. The chairman and the vice-chairman are elected by the Council.

authoritative. In any case it relieves the Minister from the task of fashioning his own compromises, and protects him from the accusation that he has accepted advice from such sources as he had found convenient.

The CHSC is, on paper, a very powerful committee; all major interests are represented, the *ex officio* appointments are out of the hands of the Minister, and it has the rights of publication and of initiative. For these reasons it was believed in some medical circles at one time that it would in practice achieve a dominant position where its advice was both necessary and largely decisive. The constitutional responsibility of the Minister and his ability to negotiate directly with interested bodies on urgent issues (instead of always consulting the Council) have prevented such a development, however, and the Council fulfils the more orthodox role expected of it by politicians and administrators.

### NATIONAL INSURANCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

(Ministry of Pensions and National Insurance)

The National Insurance Advisory Committee (NIAC) was set up by the National Insurance Act of 1946<sup>16</sup> but it had a predecessor in the Unemployment Insurance Statutory Committee. This was constituted under Section 17 of the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1934, "to give advice and assistance to the Minister in connection with the discharge of his functions under the Unemployment Insurance Acts", and to perform the other duties specified in the Act. The Committee sat under the chairmanship of Sir William Beveridge, and had six other members.

It had the duty of advising the Government whether the Unemployment Fund was likely to be faced with a deficit or to amass a surplus, and what should be done to prevent either. Draft regulations (concerning, for example, crediting of contributions) were submitted to the Committee; and problems concerning, for example, seasonal workers were submitted for consideration and advice. The Committee's work was summarised in the Annual Reports of the Ministry of Labour.

Responsibility for unemployment insurance was transferred to the new Ministry of National Insurance in April 1945. The Unemployment Insurance Statutory Committee continued in

<sup>16</sup> See also Enid Harrison, "The Work of the National Insurance Advisory Committee", *Public Administration*, Summer 1952, p. 149.

Council tend to meet at least monthly while they are taking evidence and producing their reports.

The secretaries of the committees, joint committees and standing advisory committees are Principals in the Ministry of Health; the secretary of the Council itself is an Assistant Secretary. These secretaries are appointed by the Minister, who is responsible for providing whatever staff facilities are needed. The statute also makes provision for the Council or the standing advisory committees to appoint a secretary to act jointly with the Minister's nominee if they wish, but they have not done so. There has been some experiment with joint lay and medical secretaries (from the department); but in practice it is more usual for the lay secretaries to get help as they need it from their colleagues in the Ministry.

The secretaries prepare the agenda and minutes, see to the circulation of papers and reports and deal with the routine business of the Council and committees. Papers for the most part are written in the Ministry of Health, although from time to time papers from other sources are discussed. The Council also considers reports of the various committees.

In addition investigations may be carried out. The Hospital Laundries Committee inspected the laundry arrangements in twenty-seven hospitals in different parts of the country. Questionnaires are used by some committees. The standing Tuberculosis Advisory Committee has instigated statistical analyses to find out how many patients who had recently arrived from abroad were receiving treatment for tuberculosis in sanatoria.

The Central Health Services Council publishes an annual report in addition to the occasional ones about particular subjects, and with it annual reports for the standing advisory committees. These reports are preceded by a statement by the Minister of Health. This is devoted chiefly to listing the actions the Minister has carried out on the advice of the Council or the standing advisory committees. The report also gives a schedule of the advice given to the Minister by the Council and the standing advisory committees. For 1957 seventeen items of advice are listed.

Through the Council and its various committees, the Minister receives essential technical advice, which he could not obtain in the same way from any other source. This advice has been agreed by the different branches of the medical profession and by other interested parties. It therefore has some claim to be considered

meetings last up to two days. Questions are referred to the Committee by the Minister from time to time; in 1954 these concerned widow's benefits, dependency provisions, contribution conditions and credits provisions, and the liability for contributions of persons with small incomes. In 1959 questions concerning the position of long-term hospital patients and the rules for medical certification were referred. The number of draft regulations submitted to the Committee also varies: they are currently concerned with regulations related to graduated pensions.

The secretary is a Principal and the assistant secretary an Assistant Principal (or equivalent rank) in the Ministry of Pensions and National Insurance. Apart from preparing for meetings, taking minutes and drafting reports, the secretary's main function is to assist the chairman and act as a link between the Committee and the Ministry. To do this effectively he must clearly have close relations with the Ministry's senior officers while remaining free, as the Committee's servant, to give them independent advice.

When a question or draft regulations (prepared by the Ministry) are submitted to the Committee, an arrangement is made for press releases and copies of the draft regulations are sent out. The object of this publicity is to enable all interested parties to make representations. The Ministry invariably prepares detailed notes for the Committee on the matters before them and the Committee frequently asks for additional papers on aspects which seem to it to need further exploration. In addition the Head of the Division concerned attends the meetings, to answer questions and give any other assistance required. After considering written representations, the Committee may invite witnesses to give oral evidence. The TUC and the British Employers' Confederation have usually given oral evidence on major questions.

The Minister is not obliged to publish the reports of the NIAC on questions referred to it, as was the case with the pre-war Unemployment Insurance Statutory Committee. In fact, reports have always been published, though this need not take place immediately. In the case of draft regulations, the Minister is required to lay before Parliament with the regulations themselves the report of the NIAC on the regulations as originally drafted, and a statement showing what amendments have been made since the report of the Committee, what effect has been given to their recommendations, and the reasons for not adopting any recom-

existence until 1947, when it was broadly succeeded by the National Insurance Advisory Committee. The provisions governing the constitution, membership, functions, etc., of the new Committee are set out in Sections 41 and 77 and the Fifth Schedule of the National Insurance Act of 1946. The Committee's functions are:

- (i) to consider and advise on such questions as the Minister refers to it;
- (ii) to consider and report on draft regulations.

The new Committee has no concern with the financing of the scheme; but its scope includes the whole of national insurance (but not industrial injuries), and is no longer confined to unemployment insurance.

### *Membership*

The statute provides that the Committee shall be composed of a chairman and not less than four, or more, than eight, other members, of whom at least one shall be a woman. In fact, there have always been eight members, excluding the chairman. According to the statute one member must be appointed after consultation with employers' organisations (in practice the British Employers' Confederation), one after consultation with workers' organisations (in practice the TUC), one after consultation with Friendly Societies, and one after consultation with the corresponding Ministry in Northern Ireland.

Four members are appointed at the Minister's discretion, and in making these appointments, the Minister ensures that both Wales and Scotland are represented. An academic specialising in the field of administration is also appointed. At one time a doctor was a member, and now there is an actuary. Members of Parliament are excluded from membership by statute. Members are usually appointed for a five-year term. Where a vacancy occurs in the course of a five-year period, the new appointment is made until the expiry of the period. There is a reasonable continuity of membership: in 1956 four people had been members of the Committee since 1949. There are no sub-committees.

### *Meetings and methods*

The Committee meets up to nine or ten times a year, and



television patents; and the investigation of developments at home and abroad. The chairman of this committee was Mr. G. Garro-Jones, afterwards Lord Trefgarne, and during its lifetime television was resumed in 1946 at the Alexandra Palace. The next committee, under the chairmanship of Sir William Coates, was short-lived. Set up in September 1949, it ceased to meet after November of that year when the Beveridge Broadcasting Committee was set up.

In October 1952 the present Committee was set up with the following terms of reference:

To advise the PMG on the development of television and sound broadcasting at frequencies above 30 Mc/s and related matters, including competitive television services and television for public showing in cinemas and elsewhere.

The Committee is concerned, therefore, not only with television but also with very high frequency sound broadcasting. The committee is concerned with television for the whole of the United Kingdom.

#### *Membership*

The members of the Committee are appointed by the Minister, those from the industry after consultation with the Radio Industry Council. There are four groups—-independent members, representatives from the radio industry, members from the broadcasting organisations, and civil servants.

There is an independent chairman. Since the committee began in 1952 it has been Admiral Sir Charles Daniel, a naval signals expert. There are three independent members drawn from the engineering and business worlds. Two members of the committee are from the radio manufacturing industry. The Radio Industry Council, which represents the three trade associations in the industry, suggests names for consideration. The Director-General of the BBC and the Director-General of the Independent Television Authority are also members.

Three senior civil servants are full members of the Committee—a Third Secretary from the Treasury, an Under Secretary from the Ministry of Aviation, and an Under Secretary from the Post Office, who is Director of Radio Services. The Directors-General of the BBC and ITA are supported at meetings by technical advisers, and it is customary for the chairman of the technical

mendations. The reports state what publicity has been given to the draft regulations, what their effect will be and what the present position is. They go on to summarise the representations received, to comment on them and, if the Committee thinks fit, to propose amendments. There have been a few minority reports. Where amendments are proposed, the Minister is free to accept or reject them, but in practice it is extremely rare for a Minister not to act on the Committee's recommendation.

The Industrial Injuries Council is quite distinct from NIAC and there is no overlapping membership between them. Where they have a common interest in matters before them, papers and draft recommendations are exchanged.

The Committee has high prestige in Parliament and elsewhere, as a result of its reputation for care and impartiality and of independence of the Ministry and the various interest groups. Its reports are valued for their expert and objective evaluation of complex issues, to which Parliament itself could not readily give such close examination. The fact that Ministers have almost invariably acted on the Committee's advice has obviously helped to build up its prestige. The general confidence in the Committee enables it to serve as a useful buffer between the Ministry on the one hand, and public opinion and the interested parties on the other.

### TELEVISION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

(Post Office)

The need for a Television Advisory Committee dates from the early 1930's, when television was first being developed. The present Committee has had several predecessors, each of which was set up following various broadcasting or television committees' reports. The first committee was set up in 1935, following the report of the Selsdon Television Committee in 1934-35,<sup>16</sup> to advise the Postmaster-General on points arising in connection with the initiation and development of the broadcast television service. This committee ceased to meet after February 1940. The next committee was set up in 1945 following the report of the Hankey Television Committee.<sup>17</sup> It was concerned with such matters as the planning of a television service; the co-ordination and initiation of television research; the encouragement of the pooling of

<sup>16</sup> Cmd. 4793.

<sup>17</sup> December 1944.

occasion, initiate research and it helps the various interests to divide research among themselves, and co-ordinates the results.

The development of television makes necessary from time to time high-level political decisions about its general organisation. It is not the function of the Television Advisory Committee to prompt, or to make recommendations about, these decisions. But it does establish what is technically and economically possible for future developments.

### *Negotiating committee*

## BURNHAM COMMITTEES

### (Ministry of Education)

The Burnham Committees have been statutory bodies since the 1944 Education Act; but they originated some twenty-five years earlier. The Departmental Committee on Teachers' Salaries, reporting in 1918, recommended increases in salary scales. Many local authorities accepted these recommendations, but some did not. In the summer of 1918 the President of the Board of Education set up a Standing Joint Committee on Teachers' Salaries, on which teachers and local authorities were equally represented. It was "to secure the orderly and progressive solution of the salary problem in Public Elementary Schools, by agreement, on a national basis, and its correlation with a solution of the Salary problem in Secondary Schools".<sup>18</sup> In May 1920 a second Joint Committee was set up to deal with salaries in secondary schools and in December 1920, a third for technical and other schools. Lord Burnham accepted the chairmanship of all three Committees. By October 1929 the Board of Education was able to ensure that the Burnham scale, or better, was being paid by all authorities, though two or three disputes followed between teachers and local authorities.

The Education Act of 1944 made the Burnham Committees part of the statutory machinery and at the same time reorganised their structure. Section 89 of the statute provides that:

- (1) The Minister shall secure that for the purpose of considering the remuneration of teachers there shall be one or more committees approved by him consisting of persons appointed by bodies representing local education authorities and teachers respectively,

<sup>18</sup> See R. V. Vernon and N. S. Mansergh, *op. cit.*, pp. 204-7.

sub-committee to attend. The secretary of the Committee is a Principal in the Post Office.

### *Technical sub-committee*

A technical sub-committee was appointed by the main committee soon after it began work. No members of this sub-committee are actually members of the main committee, though the chairman of the main committee attends meetings of the technical sub-committee, and the secretaries of both committees work closely together.

The chairman of the sub-committee is the Engineer-in-Chief of the GPO, and the deputy chairman is the Director of Engineering of the BBC. There are engineers from the Post Office, the BBC, and the ITA; and representatives from the industry. The other member is the Director of Radio Research of the DSIR. The secretary is drawn from the Engineering Department of the Post Office.

### *Meetings and methods*

The Committee has usually met three or four times each year but there are long intervals when the technical sub-committee is at work. The frequency of meetings is also determined by the subjects under discussion.

The Committee advises the Minister on the topics that he refers to it, but is also free to initiate and advise on other questions. Publicity is not sought for the Committee, and there are no press releases. Two reports, however, have been published—the first on the development of television in the home in 1953; the second on VHF sound broadcasting in 1954. The first report contained a reservation, the second a minority report. In the latter case the Committee's report included the report of the technical sub-committee.

The technical sub-committee usually meets about five times a year—two or three meetings, say, in between each main committee meeting. Although it does not have research establishments of its own, it makes real contributions to progress by correlating and thinking about both short-term problems and long-range speculative questions. The research is done by the interests represented on the sub-committee, the GPO, the BBC, the ITA, the DSIR and the radio industry. The sub-committee does, on

The other Burnham Committees are smaller. On the Technical Committee there are thirteen members of each panel, and on the Farm Institutes Committee there are eight members of each panel. The Training Colleges Committee is exceptional in that the teaching staff panel has only twelve members, whereas the authorities' and governors' panel has twenty.

All four Committees have the same chairman. He is nominated by the Minister and appointed by the Committee. Usually names are mentioned informally before a nomination is made, and on occasion suggestions have been resisted. It should be noted that the chairman has no voting rights.

All the Committees have two secretaries, one from the authorities' panel and one from the teachers' panel. At present the secretary for the authorities' panel on all four Committees is the General Secretary of the Association of Education Committees; the secretaries of the teachers' panel are drawn from the most appropriate organisation—thus the General Secretary of the National Union of Teachers is a secretary of the Main Committee, while a representative of the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutes is a secretary of the Technical Committee, and a representative of the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education is secretary of a panel of the Training Colleges Committee. Ultimately the Committee's work rests on the joint honorary secretaries. In practice officials of the Ministry undertake a substantial amount of work in preparing information for the Committee and maintaining records of the meetings of the full Committee. They collaborate closely with the joint honorary secretaries in all matters and particularly in the drafting of reports.

### *Meetings and methods*

The Committees meet frequently when there is a claim to be settled, and very rarely<sup>20</sup> in the periods in between. In practice a claim usually takes about six months to negotiate and may require six or more meetings of the Main Committee. The sub-committees and panels, both composed solely of members of the Main Committee, need to meet much more frequently.

The detailed work of agreeing scales, adjustments for varying qualifications and differentials is done by the panels and in sub-

<sup>20</sup> On occasion, to change the drafting of an existing agreement.

and it shall be the duty of any such Committee to submit to the Minister, whenever they think fit, or whenever they may be required by him so to do, such scales of remuneration for teachers as they consider suitable; and whenever a scale of remuneration so submitted is approved by the Minister, he may by order make such provision as appears to him to be desirable for the purpose of securing that the remuneration paid by local education authorities to teachers is in accordance therewith.

- (2) The Minister shall nominate the person who is to be the chairman approved by him for the purpose of this section.

There is now a Main Committee which deals with the Primary and Secondary Schools, a Committee for Technical, Commercial and Art Schools, Colleges and Institutes, a Committee for Farm Institutes and a Committee for Training Colleges. Burnham Committees are the only statutory negotiating bodies.<sup>19</sup>

### *Membership*

The statute provides that the representative organisations shall nominate members of the Committees. Since the Burnham Committees are negotiating bodies, they are composed of panels representative of the two sides, employers and teachers. Beyond this the statute does not prescribe the composition of the Committees, which has become established by custom.

The nominations to the authorities' panel are as follows: nine by the County Councils Association; six by the Association of Municipal Corporations; six by the Association of Education Committees; three by the London County Council; and two by the Welsh Joint Education Committee. On the teachers' panel there are sixteen from the National Union of Teachers; four from the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions; two from the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters; two from the Incorporated Association of Assistant Mistresses; one from the Incorporated Association of Headmasters; and one from the Incorporated Association of Headmistresses. Thus both panels are composed of twenty-six members. The National Union of Teachers is under-represented, and the Headmasters and Headmistresses Associations are over-represented in proportion to the numbers of their members.

<sup>19</sup> There is also a Committee on Salary Scales and Service Conditions for Inspectors, School Organisers and Advisory Officers of Local Education Authorities; but this is not a statutory body.

by the Minister, are mandatory on all local authorities. They do not discuss conditions of service. This gap is not so serious as it might be, for practically the same people discuss conditions of service, though not as the Burnham Committees.

As there is no change in salaries unless both sides agree, the authorities, in a time of inflation, are in a strong position; though in a time of falling price levels the teachers would be advantageously placed. The questions which cause the most trouble, apart from that of the basic scale, are those of differentials and graduate equivalents.

The Burnham Committees are classed as Government advisory committees because they have a statutory relationship to the Minister of Education and because he plays a part in enforcing their agreements. But in practice these committees are negotiating bodies like Whitley Councils and other joint negotiating committees, and the Government plays no part in the actual operation of the committees.

*Advisory committee with administrative functions*

**COLONIAL RESEARCH COUNCIL**

(Colonial Office)

The origin of the Council lies with the Colonial Research Committee set up in June 1942. The Colonial Development and Welfare Act of 1940 had set aside a maximum of £500,000 a year to be spent on colonial research, and a Government statement of policy at that time had proposed an advisory committee. War conditions, however, postponed the establishment of the Committee for two years; in the meantime research grants were made without consultation.

A research committee had existed from 1919 to 1928 to advise on some small-scale research that was then undertaken, and the Colonial Development Act of 1929 included provision for research, and a Colonial Development Advisory Committee under this Act advised on research among other matters. Neither of these earlier committees included scientists. In contrast the new committee was designed to provide permanent assistance from scientific experts.

Some research matters were being dealt with by other colonial advisory bodies—e.g. the Colonial Advisory Council on Agricul-

committees. Each panel, representing the different groups on the authorities' and teachers' side, has to arrive at agreement within itself if it is to put its case effectively to the opposing panel. The sub-committees, composed of representatives from both panels, work to secure agreement on particular problems. When agreement is reached in a sub-committee, a report is submitted to the Main Committee, and it is always accepted. The real work of the Main Committee lies in working out the basic scale. This is the most important aspect of the negotiations involving all teachers and to which allowances and additions are secondary, particularly as regards cost. The actual procedure of negotiation on the Burnham Committees themselves shares a peculiarity with the Whitley Councils and other negotiating bodies in that only the leader of each side takes part in the discussion, though the other members are present.

The chairman, as has been mentioned, has no vote. A report is therefore the result of agreement between the two panels. As there is no provision for arbitration, there can be no settlement unless both panels agree. Agreement is not always easy to obtain and there have been a number of occasions when issues have been referred to the chairman or outsiders, if not for arbitration, at least for advice to facilitate a settlement. As an example, the question of London weighting was referred to a committee composed of Sir David Hughes-Parry, Sir William Cleary and Sir John Maude. This method of working is probably due to the success of the first Chairman of the Committees, Lord Burnham, in breaking a deadlock in the salary negotiations of 1924-25.<sup>21</sup> Matters cannot be referred to this sort of unofficial arbitration, whether of the chairman or others, unless both panels are agreed that this should be done; but, having agreed, it is very difficult for them to refuse the solution proposed.

It is through the chairman that the committees communicate with the Minister and it is he who transmits the report to the Minister. The Minister has power to accept or reject a report, but he has no power to amend it. This is in contrast with the position in Scotland, where the Secretary of State may make alterations. The Minister has never refused a report, and it would be extremely difficult for him to do so.

The Committees negotiate salary scales, which, when approved

<sup>21</sup> See R. V. Vernon and N. S. Mansergh, *op. cit.*, p. 206.



*Membership*

The Council had in 1958 a membership of ten. In 1943-44 the membership was as small as six, and in 1949-50 was as large as fourteen. The chairman of the Council from 1953-56 was the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for the Colonies. In 1956 the Minister of State for Colonial Affairs took over the chairmanship. After 1949-50 the deputy chairman was the Deputy Under Secretary of State in charge of Economic Affairs.

Most of the members were chairmen of the specialised committees. There were also a few independent members. These decreased in number after 1948 when the Council was reorganised, and by 1958 there were only two; the Secretary of the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research and the Professor of Organic Chemistry at Cambridge, who joined the Council in 1956. No independent member served in any way *ex officio*.

It was not usually found necessary to define the exact status of the secretary, whether of the Council or the committees. Generally speaking the secretary is not a member of the research committees; exceptions are the Colonial Medical Research Committee and the Colonial Agricultural Research Committee. In the case of the Colonial Research Council he was an Assistant Secretary of the Colonial Office.

The size of the ten committees and sixteen sub-committees, which were associated with the Council until 1959, varies considerably from twenty-one for the Committee for Colonial Agriculture, Animal Health and Forestry Research to four for the Personnel Sub-Committee of the Colonial Medical Research Committee, or for the Linguistics Committee of the Colonial Social Science Research Council. There is much overlapping membership, particularly between committees and sub-committees dealing with related subjects. Interest in colonial work is universal in some fields—e.g. tropical medicine—but it is not so easy to find members (or research workers) in, say, the social sciences who specialise in colonial problems.

Members were normally appointed for a term of three years, and were usually reappointed. Members could, of course, retire before their term of appointment expired—hence the appointments were staggered. The Road Research Committee adopted a system of rotating membership and this system was adopted to a limited extent by the Pesticides Research Committee. It was

ture, Animal Health and Forestry, and the Colonial Economic Advisory Committee. By 1958, however, most advice on research (financed, either in whole or in part, by the British Government) had been brought under the aegis of the Council. In March 1948 reorganisation in the Colonial development field took place, and at the same time the Colonial Research Committee became the Colonial Research Council, with the Parliamentary Secretary for the Colonies as chairman. The number of specialist committees attached to the Council in 1958 was nine, in addition to the Anti-Locust Research Centre, with its own advisory committee. In 1959 the Council was replaced by the Overseas Research Council, responsible to the Minister for Science. The various specialist committees continue their work at the Colonial Office. This account refers throughout to the situation in 1958.

The Council retained the terms of reference given to it in 1948. They were:

to advise the Secretary of State for the Colonies on general questions relating to research policy in the Colonial Empire or for its benefit; to co-ordinate the work of the various committees which at present advise the Secretary of State on special aspects of research; and to tender advice to the Secretary of State on research matters not falling within the province of any of these committees.

In practice the main function of the Council was to recommend an allocation of the approximately £1½ million per annum which was spent on Colonial research; that is, it recommended an allocation of the money between the various branches of research for which the specialist committees were responsible. These committees made, and continue to make, allocations to specific projects. Fields of research which had no specialist committee were dealt with by the Council, which considered specific projects in these fields. The functions of the committees are advisory only, though their suggestions are normally accepted.

Though the Council had co-ordinating duties, it did not control the specialist committees. These were (and still are) all appointed by the Colonial Secretary and advised him directly. Many committees have sub-committees, membership of which is not drawn exclusively from the main committees. Co-ordination was achieved not only through the Council and the administrative work of the secretariat in the Colonial Office, but also by interlocking membership among related committees.

of membership and consultation within the department where necessary.

In some cases the Colonial Office financed research which was being done by a member of a committee. In some instances it is desirable for fundamental research to be done in the United Kingdom, where the necessary specialised equipment and qualified staff are more readily available. The Colonial Office was responsible for the expenditure of the money and had to justify it to the Public Accounts Committee. Annual reports on the work of the Council and specialist committees were published, bound together, and amounted to volumes of some three hundred pages. In practice the functions of the Council amounted virtually to "administration", since its recommendations were always accepted. Its advisory status was necessary since the Secretary of State had to retain final responsibility for decisions, and was accountable to the House of Commons for moneys voted by it. It brought into the administrative process independent first-class experts necessary for judging the progress of research and the suitability of specialised projects.

Though the Colonial Research Council itself has been succeeded by the Overseas Research Council, the important work of the specialist committees continues, and their close and intimate advice is still available to the Colonial Secretary, who is still responsible for spending colonial development and welfare funds.

normally the practice that when a member retired from his professorship or other office, he retired also from the Council and its committees; thus the membership consisted of men and women who were active and in touch with their subjects.

Appointments were made by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. In selecting members, a balance was kept as far as possible between the different disciplines. The Council and the committees had no fixed size, and they could be increased, if desired, with relative ease. They were also free to invite men and women with special knowledge and experience to discuss their speciality at a committee meeting. Some of the committees, e.g. the Pesticides Research Committee and the Colonial Products Council, are provided with scientific secretaries who are qualified to write their technical reports. Papers for the committees to study were prepared by the secretaries, and these papers were usually about proposed schemes for research, on which the committees' recommendations were sought regarding the scientific merits of the scheme and its suitability for assistance from colonial development and welfare funds.

#### *Meetings and methods*

Schemes were suggested by Colonial Governments, by the committees and by the advisers to the Secretary of State. These schemes were examined first of all in the Colonial Office, to see whether they were *prima facie* reasonable and desirable, and to assess the Colony's ability to meet part of the cost from its own resources. A paper was circulated to committee members in the light of this. The Council and the committees reached their decisions by an informal process of discussion: no votes were taken. If there were disagreements it was for the Secretary and the Colonial Office representatives to reduce as far as possible the measure of disagreement.

The Council met usually to discuss overall research policy and finance, but not more than twice a year at the most. Most of the committees meet more frequently. A good deal of business is conducted by correspondence between the members of the committees and the Colonial Office, in consultation where necessary with overseas governments. There is no specific machinery providing for co-ordination between the research committees and the other advisory committees; this is provided for by overlapping

Later in the year the Council considered other markets, particularly Russia and China and the various restrictions on trade with these countries. It also discussed a paper by the Ministry of Supply on the impact of the defence programme on the engineering industry. The Council's concern with Russian and Chinese markets continued into 1957, and early in that year the proposal for a European free trade area was put before the Council. In March a special meeting discussed a Board of Trade memorandum on this subject, and the President replied to comments made on it by industrialists. The free trade area continued to be reviewed at summer meetings, but did not come up later in the year.

The general export situation was discussed in April and the factors which helped or hindered British efforts considered. Domestic developments such as the change in defence policy, automation, and development in the iron and steel industry, were reported to the Council and discussed. At the end of the year the North American markets and trade with China were the subject of Ministerial reports to the Council, and there was a discussion between the Council and members of the Canadian Trade Mission.

In 1958 the Council continued with topics such as exports to North America and steel supplies. The Minister of Education attended to discuss the expansion of technical education. The developments in engineering statistics and the problems of standards for screw threads were brought before the Council, and a special paper on the machine tool industry was discussed. The question of East-West trade was again taken up and in the summer consideration was given to the general state of the engineering industry, and prospects of its expansion.

The Council seems to have been more concerned with the general economic situation as it affected engineering than with the details of developments in the industry itself, and with exports rather than the home market. Much of the argument follows expected lines—the employers frequently attributed their difficulties in competing abroad to high labour costs, and the trade unionists found other causes such as technical backwardness. But much discussion took place between the Government and the employers, or the Government and trade unionists—on, for example, the free trade area or East-West trade. Many discussions began with a report by Government representatives (for example on German competition, automation, technical educa-

## THE INFLUENCE OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES: TWO EXAMPLES

THE best way to assess the part played by advisory committees in the formation of Government policies would be to examine closely the work and recommendations of particular committees over a period and compare them with Government decisions, and then to trace the connection between them. It is not possible to carry out such an examination without access to departmental papers, and the notes which follow do not aspire to be more than indications from the sources available of what two advisory committees have done.

The studies take different forms. One is a description of the topics discussed by a consultative committee; the other shows the action taken after a set of recommendations had been made by an expert committee.

### THE WORK OF THE ENGINEERING ADVISORY COUNCIL, 1955-58

The Engineering Advisory Council, set up in 1946, had held about forty meetings by 1955. It consists of eleven industrialists and eleven trade unionists, with a number of civil servants present and the President of the Board of Trade in the chair. An account of its composition and methods is given on page 145.

The main preoccupations of the Council at the end of 1955 and the beginning of 1956 were overseas markets and steel supplies. There was discussion of the export situation which the autumn Budget of 1955 aimed to improve, followed by consideration of current prospects for engineering exports in the Middle East and in Western Europe. This led to special attention being given to the effects of German competition, and a working party of officials presented a twenty-page paper which was considered in the summer. The Council was consulted about the forthcoming tariff negotiations at Geneva (and stressed the need to maintain adequate protection for certain products), and about the steel shortage and future supplies on which the Iron and Steel Board presented a paper.

- (v) The practice of employing married women graduates part-time should be extended.
- (vi) Part-time teaching by university research workers or industrial scientists should be organised where practicable.
- (vii) The Ministry should prepare a pamphlet on careers in education for mathematics and science graduates.

The level of salaries is outside the competence of the Council, so that the Council only observed that it was "satisfied that financial prospects are a main factor in the situation".<sup>2</sup>

The Advisory Council on Scientific Policy considered these recommendations, adding some comments of its own.<sup>3</sup>

First, it suggested that university vacation or week-end courses should be provided for science teachers to keep them abreast of recent developments in their subject and to help prevent entry into the teaching profession becoming tantamount to a divorce from the scientific world. This suggestion was referred to the University Grants Committee, to pass on to the universities.<sup>4</sup>

Secondly, the Advisory Council on Scientific Policy, while agreeing that starting salaries for teachers were as good as elsewhere, thought that prospects were most unfavourable. It supported the Ministry's policy of urging local authorities to make wide use of the provisions for special allowances. Local authorities were asked to state the principles on which they awarded allowances and to estimate the expenditure under this head for the next financial year.<sup>5</sup> This information was sent on to the Burnham Committee, to consider whether existing arrangements were satisfactory.

The Minister commended the report of the National Advisory Council to local authorities, urging them to make the best use of their science and mathematics staff, by arrangements between neighbouring schools and technical colleges, by deferring retirement of such teachers, by employing married women and by part-time employment of scientists working in industry and universities.

As a result of the publication of the report, a conference rep-

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 38.

<sup>3</sup> Seventh Annual Report (1953-54), Cmd. 9260, September 1954

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 14.

<sup>5</sup> See Ministry of Education Annual Report, 1954, Cmd. 9521, Ch. I, para. 32,

tion, Ministerial visits to foreign countries). Sometimes the trade unionists put forward a paper (trade with the Communist bloc, effect of defence cuts) and sometimes members of the Council were invited to comment on various matters (import duties on machinery, the standardisation of screw threads, the general state of the industry in the summer of 1958).

During this period very little attention was paid by the House of Commons to the engineering industry as such. There were a number of Parliamentary Questions, often concerned with labour relations, and a debate on the motor industry in February 1957. The strike of May 1957 was not discussed by the Council (but did not hold up its discussion of other matters), and only impinged on the House of Commons through Questions.

#### A REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE TRAINING AND SUPPLY OF TEACHERS, 1953-55

The influence of advisory committees can occasionally be traced by means of published documents. The advice of the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers on the shortage of science teachers is an example.

The Council, set up in 1949, has about fifty members, most of whom are nominated by organisations concerned with its problems—local authority associations, the National Union of Teachers, and other teachers' associations. It meets in full at least twice a year but works mainly through sub-committees. Six of its reports had been published by 1958. A fuller account of its composition and functions is given on page 163.

In November 1953 the Council published a report on "Graduate teachers of mathematics and science",<sup>1</sup> which made seven proposals for trying to overcome the shortage of teachers:

- (i) Laboratory assistants on national salary scales should be employed.
- (ii) Better equipment should be provided to improve conditions for teaching.
- (iii) Teachers should stay on after the retiring age.
- (iv) The Minister's proposal to allow forty-five years' service and service up to seventy years of age to count for pension should be applied.

<sup>1</sup> HMSO, 1953.



in the chemical, electrical and mechanical engineering industries established a trust to give financial help to the teaching of pure and applied science in independent and direct grant schools.

In brief, then, an advisory committee published a report making recommendations on how to overcome a particular problem. The report was considered by the Minister and by, ultimately, three other Government committees, each of which made further suggestions. Special conferences of all possible interested parties were held in addition and made more suggestions, affecting Government departments.

The results are not unimpressive. Four of the original seven recommendations were adopted. Salary payments were increased; conscription was modified; an educational trust was set up by a group of industrial firms. Altogether some six Government departments and some 180 local authorities, besides innumerable headmistresses and headmasters and many industrial firms, were affected.

Nevertheless, the Council did not recommend anything very difficult or very unpopular. Thus, the allowances for science and mathematics teachers are not very expensive; the part-time employment of married women offends no one; a new pamphlet is easy to produce; and to a Government intending to reduce and ultimately abolish conscription the deferment of scientists presents an easy beginning.

Other recommendations less easy of fulfilment have taken longer to implement. Before 1958 the Government gave absolute priority to the provision of new school places, but since 1958-59 about £2 million per annum has been allocated for the provision and equipping of new science accommodation. Some capital expenditure controls which, *inter alia*, limited equipment in new school laboratories have now been removed. A national pay scale for school laboratory assistants has yet to be agreed, though in 1954 the Minister endorsed the Council's recommendation that there should be more widespread employment of these assistants, and the Council's proposals in this field continue to be pressed.

The part played by the House of Commons in this matter was largely supplementary. It is obvious that many Members followed developments very closely and frequently asked Questions about the progress being made; and the problems were touched in a general debate on scientific and technical manpower in July 1955.

representative of employers of scientists was held in January 1954 under the auspices of the Federation of British Industries. In July it recommended to the Minister an expansion of university science departments, an increase in the number of pupils taking science courses in grammar schools, a revision of teachers' salaries and a modification of national service for graduates intending to become science teachers. This was also recommended by the Advisory Council on Scientific Policy and the Scottish Committee under the chairmanship of Sir Edward Appleton. The Minister discussed these recommendations with representatives of the Committee and of the Federation of British Industries. Further conferences between universities, industry, schools and the Department were held.<sup>6</sup> In 1955 a revised version of the pamphlet, *A Career in Education for University Graduates*, was brought out following the seventh recommendation of the National Advisory Council.

The Burnham Committee recommended amendments to the special allowances provisions, designed to increase the funds available and to clarify and, in effect, to extend the conditions on which they were payable.

The Minister of Labour and National Service stated that from 1956 deferment would be granted to first and second class honours graduates in mathematics and science, who wished to take up specified teaching posts, involving advanced work. This was an improvement on the recommendation of the Conference held under the auspices of the Federation of British Industries which had suggested the early release of such students. From January 1958, deferment was extended to any graduate in chemistry, biology or general science taking up a teaching post in a grant-aided or efficient<sup>7</sup> secondary school. Deferment for graduates in mathematics and physics was limited to holders of first and second class honours degrees to provide for the needs of the armed services. From January 1959 deferment to teach has been granted to every graduate in mathematics or science who takes a post in a secondary school which offers science courses leading to the GCE.

The advantage of discussing problems with non-official bodies is shown in another development. A number of large companies

<sup>6</sup> Ministry of Education Annual Report, 1955, Cmd. 9785, Ch. I, paras. 29-40.

<sup>7</sup> Recognised as efficient by the Ministry of Education.

## SPECIAL STUDY IV

### MAJOR NOMINATING BODIES

THE lists give the advisory committees (within the scope of this report) to which a number of leading independent organisations acknowledge sending representatives or suggesting names for inclusion. They do not necessarily include all committees where the method of nomination or suggestion is private and informal. Other trade associations, Chambers of Commerce, employers' associations, professional bodies, trade unions and national organisations of various types, of course, put forward suggestions both for the committees listed and for many not mentioned here.

Two points about the lists should be emphasised. First, the fact that they are based on cases where the organisations *acknowledge* making nominations makes it unlikely that the entries are closely comparable; for in similar circumstances one organisation will claim to have put forward a committee member while another will regard the arrangements as too personal to be publicly acknowledged. Secondly, the strict application of the definition of "Government advisory committee" makes the lists misleadingly short—some organisations make nominations for over a hundred committees or similar bodies of one sort or another.

#### INDUSTRIAL ORGANISATIONS

Association of British Chambers of Commerce (13)

National Production Advisory Council on Industry

Consultative Committee for Industry (and Bilateral Trade Negotiations sub-committee)

Exhibitions Advisory Committee

Census of Production Advisory Committee

Committee on EPA matters

Civil Defence Joint Planning Staff Advisory Panel

National Advisory Council on the Employment of the Disabled

Central Transport Consultative Committee

Industrial Coal Consumers' Council

Oil Consumers' Council

Post Office Advisory Council

Joint Committee for National Certificates in Commerce

National Advisory Council on Education for Industry and Commerce

The initial proposals came from the Advisory Council, therefore, but the Commons' vigilance was significant in ensuring that they were not ignored. It is not the case, of course, that no interest was taken in this problem before the Advisory Council reported, or that nothing would have been done if there had been no such report; but its work did provide a focus for discussion and its proposals a programme for action.

Exhibitions Advisory Committee  
 Revolving Fund (Loans to Industry) Committee  
 Central Transport Consultative Committee  
 Industrial Coal Consumers' Council  
 Oil Consumers' Council  
 Census of Production Advisory Committee  
 Post Office Advisory Council  
 Civil Defence Joint Planning Staff Advisory Panel  
 National Advisory Council on Education for Industry and Commerce

### Trades Union Congress (30)

National Production Advisory Council on Industry  
 Economic Planning Board  
 Development Areas Treasury Advisory Committee  
 National Joint Advisory Council (and the Joint Consultative Committee)  
 Consultative Committee for Industry  
 Committee on EPA matters  
 Census of Production Advisory Committee  
 Census of Distribution Advisory Committee  
 Cinematograph Films Council  
 Companies Act General Consultative Committee  
 Duty-free Machinery Imports Committees  
 National Advisory Council on the Employment of the Disabled  
 Cost of Living Advisory Committee  
 Women's Consultative Committee  
 National Insurance Advisory Committee  
 Industrial Injuries Advisory Council  
 Industrial Coal Consumers' Council  
 Domestic Coal Consumers' Council  
 Oil Consumers' Council  
 Central Transport Consultative Committee  
 Committee on Road Safety  
 National Civil Aviation Consultative Council  
 Consumers' Committees (under the Agricultural Marketing Act)  
 National Advisory Council on Education for Industry and Commerce  
 Civil Defence Joint Planning Staff Advisory Panel  
 Colonial Labour Advisory Committee  
 Oversea Migration Board  
 Advisory Committee on the Legal Aid and Advice Act  
 National Consultative Council on the Recruitment of Nurses and Midwives  
 Advisory Panel for Industrial Films

**British Employers' Confederation (13)**

National Production Advisory Council on Industry

Economic Planning Board

National Joint Advisory Council (and the Joint Consultative Committee)  
Committee on EPA matters

National Advisory Council on the Employment of the Disabled

Cost of Living Advisory Committee

National Insurance Advisory Committee

Industrial Injuries Advisory Council

Advisory Council on the relationship between employment in the Services and  
Civilian Life

Advisory Panel for Industrial Films

Oversea Migration Board

Industrial Health Advisory Committee

National Consultative Council on Recruitment of Nurses and Midwives

**Federation of British Industries (21)**

National Production Advisory Council on Industry

Economic Planning Board

Consultative Committee for Industry (and Bilateral Trade Negotiations sub-  
committee)

Advisory Committee on Commercial Information Overseas

Exhibitions Advisory Committee

Duty-free Machinery Imports Committee

Census of Production Advisory Committee

Committee on EPA matters

Advisory Panel for Industrial Films

Civil Defence Joint Planning Staff Advisory Panel

National Advisory Council on Education for Industry and Commerce

Central Advisory Water Committee

Clean Air Council for England and Wales

Water Pollution Research Board

Technical Personnel Committee

Industrial Coal Consumers' Council

Oil Consumers' Council

Central Transport Consultative Committee

National Civil Aviation Consultative Council

Scottish Advisory Council for Education

Clean Air Council for Scotland

**National Union of Manufacturers (11)**

National Production Advisory Council on Industry

Consultative Committee for Industry (and Bilateral Trade Negotiations sub-  
committee)

Fire Service College Board  
 Police Council  
 Police Council for Great Britain  
 Police Promotions Examination Board  
 Police College Board of Governors  
 Central Committee on Common Police Services  
 Joint Negotiating Committee for the Probation Service  
 Protection of Birds Advisory Committee  
 National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers  
 Secondary Schools Examination Council  
 Burnham Committees  
 National Advisory Council on the Employment of the Disabled  
 National Institute of Houseworkers Advisory Council  
 National Advisory Council for the Recruitment of Nurses and Midwives  
 Central Health Services Council  
 Advisory Committee for the Health and Welfare of Handicapped Persons

**Association of Education Committees (5)**

Burnham Committees  
 National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers  
 Secondary Schools Examination Council  
 Committee on Road Safety  
 National Institute of Houseworkers Advisory Council

**National Union of Teachers (5)**

Burnham Committees  
 National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers  
 Secondary Schools Examination Council  
 Committee on Road Safety  
 National Institute of Houseworkers Advisory Council

**OTHER NATIONAL ORGANISATIONS****National Farmers' Union (16)**

Agricultural Improvement Council for England and Wales  
 Poultry (Stock Improvement) Advisory Committee  
 Agricultural Machinery Advisory Committee  
 Joint Panel of Crop Protection Products Approved Scheme  
 Oats and Barley Deficiency Payments Advisory Committee  
 Wheat Deficiency Payments Advisory Committee  
 Sugar Beet Research and Education Committee  
 Land Pests Advisory Committee  
 Advisory Committee under the Fertiliser and Feedingstuffs Act, 1926  
 Agricultural Statistics Advisory Committee  
 Committee on Agricultural Valuation  
 Central Advisory Committee on Artificial Insemination  
 Joint Advisory Panel on Fatstock Guarantee Scheme  
 Bull and Boar Licensing Advisory Committee  
 Central Advisory Water Committee  
 Central Transport Consultative Committee

**Association of Municipal Corporations (16)**

Central Fire Brigades Advisory Council  
 Fire Service College Board  
 Central Transport Consultative Committee  
 Committee on Road Safety  
 Advisory Committee on Oil Pollution of the Sea  
 Police Council  
 Police Council for Great Britain  
 Police Promotions Examination Board  
 Police College Board of Governors  
 Central Committee on Common Police Services  
 Joint Negotiating Committee for the Probation Service  
 National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers  
 Secondary Schools Examination Council  
 Burnham Committees  
 National Institute of Houseworkers Advisory Council  
 National Advisory Council for the Recruitment of Nurses and Midwives

**County Councils Association (20)**

Central Transport Consultative Committee  
 Committee on Road Safety  
 Advisory Committee on Oil Pollution of the Sea  
 Central Fire Brigades Advisory Council



# ADVISORY COMMITTEES IN 1958

199

	Non-official 11	Official 2
Pig Recording Advisory Committee		
Hill Farming Advisory Committee for England, Wales and Northern Ireland (Hill Farming Act, 1946, Sec. 32. 1946 Act amended and extended by the Livestock Rearing Act, 1951, and the Hill Farming Act, 1956)	18	0
Hill Farming Advisory Committee for England, Wales and Northern Ireland, Sub-Committee for Wales and Monmouth (Statutes as above)	13	0
Joint Advisory Panel on the Fatstock Guarantee Scheme	22	6
Technical Advisory Committee on Meat Research	21	6
Bee Diseases Advisory Committee (Agriculture (Misc. Prov.) Act, 1941, Sec. II)	9	1
Consultative Committee on ECE and OEEC Horticultural Affairs	9	2
Poultry (Stock Improvement) Advisory Committee	22	2
Advisory Committee on the Provincial Agricultural Economics Service	16	2
Conference of Provincial Agricultural Economists	11	1
Agricultural Statistics Advisory Committee (Agriculture Act, 1947, Sec. 77)	7	1
Consumers' Committee for England and Wales (Agricultural Marketing Act, 1931, Sec. 9)	10	0
Consumers' Committee for Great Britain (Agricultural Marketing Act, 1931, Sec. 9, as amended by Sec. 18 (6) of the Agricultural Marketing Act, 1949)	13	0
Committee of Investigation for England and Wales (Agricultural Marketing Act, 1931, Sec. 9)	6	0
Committee of Investigation for Great Britain (Agricultural Marketing Act, 1931, as amended by Sec. 18 (6) of the Agricultural Marketing Act, 1949)	7	0
Agricultural Marketing Facilities Committee for Great Britain (Agricultural Marketing Act, 1931, Sec. 12, as amended by Sec. 18 (6) of the Agricultural Marketing Act, 1949)	7	0
Agricultural Marketing Facilities Committee for England and Wales (Agricultural Marketing Act, 1931, Sec. 12)	6	0
National Food Survey Committee	5	6
Grassland Utilisation Committee	11	0
Oats and Barley Deficiency Payments Advisory Committee	9	2

## SPECIAL STUDY V

## ADVISORY COMMITTEES IN 1958

THESE lists follow the definition used in the rest of the report: bodies attached to central Government departments in an advisory capacity, containing non-official members, and of a standing rather than a temporary character. Figures are given for both non-official members and official members, but in many cases the number of official members, in particular, varies from meeting to meeting. Official members sometimes include Ministers as well as civil servants. Where there is statutory authority for a committee this is noted in brackets. It must be emphasised that the lists refer to March 1958, and are not intended as an up-to-date guide to the current situation.

## ADMIRALTY (13)

	Non-official	Official
Education Advisory Committee for the Royal Navy	8	4
Shipping Defence Advisory Committee	4	11
Shipping Defence Personnel and Training Committee	8	8
Medical Consultative Board	6	2
Advisory Committee on Naval Chaplaincy Service	4	4
Shipbuilding Advisory Committee	13	7
Admiralty Dry Docks Committee	2	7
Inter-departmental Scientific and Technical Committee on Optical Glass	5	10
R.N.R. (General Service) General Committee	8	12
R.N.R. (Patrol Service) General Committee	8	12
Fuel and Lubricants Advisory Committee	7	16
Preservation of Wooden Vessels Committee	4	4
H.M.S. <i>Victory</i> (Ship) Advisory Technical Committee	8	4

## MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FISHERIES AND FOOD (54)

	Non-official	Official
Agricultural Improvement Council for England and Wales	17	1
Smallholdings Advisory Council (Agricultural Act, 1947, Part IV)	18	0
Bull and Boar Licensing Advisory Committee	13	2
Central Advisory Committee on Artificial Insemination	13	2

# ADVISORY COMMITTEES IN 1958

201

International Fisheries Convention, 1946, United Kingdom  
Consultative Committee

Non- official	Official
16	12

## AIR MINISTRY (12)

Air Cadet Council  
Scottish Air Cadet Council  
ATC Central Council of Welfare  
ATC Scottish Council of Welfare  
Air Advisory Committee (Auxiliary and Reserve Forces)  
Advisory Board on Chaplaincy Services  
Education Advisory Committee for the RAF  
Flying Personnel Research Committee  
Medical Advisory Board  
Meteorological Committee  
Meteorological Research Committee and Sub-Committees  
Advisory Committee on Meteorology for Scotland

Non- official	Official
23	10
16	7
27	1
23	1
8	5
6	2
12	6
5	5
3	2
5	0
18	27
7	4

## COLONIAL OFFICE (29)

Colonial Research Council  
Advisory Committee on Co-operation in the Colonies  
Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies  
Advisory Committee on Colonial Geology and Mineral  
Resources  
Advisory Committee on Social Development in the Colonies  
Advisory Committee on Treatment of Offenders in the  
Colonies  
Colonial Advisory Council of Agriculture, Animal Health  
and Forestry  
Colonial Advisory Medical Committee  
Colonial Agriculture, Animal Health and Forestry Research  
Committee  
Colonial Agricultural Machinery Advisory Committee  
Colonial Economic Research Committee  
Colonial Fisheries Advisory Committee  
Colonial Housing and Town Planning Advisory Panel  
Colonial Labour Advisory Committee  
Colonial Local Government Advisory Panel  
Colonial Medical Research Committee

Non- official	Official
8	2
6	3
26	7
15	7
16	4
7	10
16	7
12	12
11	13
17	7
7	3
8	3
7	1
16	4
8	3
13	1

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Wheat Deficiency Payments Advisory Committee	7	2
Authorisation of Merchants Advisory Panel	4	3
Crop Protection Products Approval Scheme Advisory Committee	6	4
Joint Panel of the Advisory Committee of the Crop Protection Products Approval Scheme	14	6
Agricultural Machinery Advisory Committee	15	6
Advisory Committee on Research designed to improve Sea Defence	6	7
Advisory Committee on Oceanographic and Meteorological Research	3	6
Central Scholarships Committee	9	0
Agricultural Colleges Committee	3	1
Sugar Beet Research and Education Committee	10	2
Committee on Agricultural Valuation (Agricultural Holdings Act, 1948, Sec. 79)	12	5
Advisory Committee on the Farm Improvement Scheme	14	6
Glanllyn Advisory Committee	14	0
Advisory Committee under Fertilisers and Feedingstuffs Act, 1926 (Fertilisers and Feedingstuffs Act, 1926, Sec. 23)	27	0
Milk and Milk Products Technical Advisory Committee	13	6
Advisory Committee on the Revolving Loan for Agriculture	5	0
Oils and Fats Advisory Panel	8	6
Merchandise Marks Standing Committee (Merchandise Marks Act, 1926, Sec. 4)	3	0
Food Standards Committee	8	7
Land Pests Advisory Committee	10	5
Land Pests Advisory Committee for Wales	9	2
Joint Standing Consultative and Advisory Committee on Infestation of Food		
Shipping Panel	7	4
Transport and Warehousing Panel	14	1
Food Trade Panel	15	1
Joint Standing Consultative Committee on Rodent Control	15	7
Central Sewer Committee	12	3
Advisory Committee on Poisonous Substances used in Agriculture and Food Storage	3	11
Advisory Committee on Poisonous Substances used in Agriculture and Food Storage, Scientific Sub-Committee	4	10
White Fish Industry Advisory Council (Sea Fish Industry Act, 1951, Sec. 3)	52	0

# ADVISORY COMMITTEES IN 1958

203

	Non-official	Official
Training College Committee (Education Act, 1944, Sec. 89)	33	0
Victoria and Albert Museum Advisory Council	17	1
Science Museum Advisory Council	12	4
Secondary School Examinations Council	32	6
National Advisory Council on Education for Industry and Commerce	72	9
National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers	50	4
Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children	8	2
Camping Advisory Committee	14	4
Joint Committee for Award of National Certificates in Building	12	4
Joint Committee for Award of National Certificates in Commerce	19	3
Joint Committee for Award of National Retail Distribution Certificates	21	2

## MINISTRY OF HEALTH (23)

	Non-official	Official
Central Health Services Council	41	0
(National Health Service Act, 1946, Sec. 2)	20	0
Standing Cancer Radio-therapy Advisory Committee	14	0
Standing Dental Advisory Committee	21	0
Standing Maternity and Midwifery Advisory Committee	25	0
Standing Medical Advisory Committee	16	0
Standing Mental Health Advisory Committee	22	0
Standing Nursing Advisory Committee	14	0
Standing Ophthalmic Advisory Committee	13	0
Standing Pharmaceutical Advisory Committee	14	0
Standing Tuberculosis Advisory Committee		
(All these as above)	11	0
Classification of Proprietary Preparations Joint Committee	17	0
Poliomyelitis Vaccine Joint Committee		
Remuneration of General Practitioners Distribution Com- mittee (England and Wales)	11	4
Remuneration of General Practitioners International Distri- bution Committee	8	8
Dental Manpower Committee	10	9
National Medical Manpower Committee	10	11
Drug Requirements Advisory Committee		8

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Colonial Native Law Advisory Panel	5	2
Colonial Pesticides Research Committee	8	11
Colonial Products Council	10	5
Colonial Social Science Research Council	9	1
Colonial University Grants Advisory Committee	7	2
Consultative Committee on the Welfare of Colonial Students in the United Kingdom	13	3
Council for Overseas Colleges of Arts, Science and Technology	11	5
East African Currency Board	2	2
West African Currency Board	1	4
Falkland Islands Dependencies Scientific Committee	3	6
Inter-University Council for Higher Education Overseas	43	1
Managing Committees of the Bureau of Hygiene and Tropical Diseases	9	5
Tsetse Fly and Trypanosomiasis Committee	11	6

## COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS OFFICE (5)

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Oversea Migration Board	12	1
Indian Military Service Family Pension Fund Consultative Committee	3	0
Indian Civil Service Family Pension Fund Consultative Committee	3	0
Indian Military Widows' and Orphans' Fund Consultative Committee	3	0
Superior Services (India) Family Pension Fund Consultative Committee	3	0

## MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (16)

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Central Advisory Council for Education (England) (Education Act, 1944, Sec. 4)	31	1
Central Advisory Council for Education (Wales) (As above)	23	0
Burnham Committees:		
Main Committee	53	0
Technical Committee	27	0
Farm Institute Committee	17	0

# ADVISORY COMMITTEES IN 1958

205

	Non-official	Official
Advisory Committee on the Administration of the Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876 (Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876)	11	0
London Juvenile Courts Consultative Committee	16	2
Advisory Committee for the admission of Jewish Ecclesiastical Officers to the United Kingdom	12	0
Advisory Committee on Deprivation of Citizenship (British Nationality Act, 1948, Sec. 20 (6) and (7))	5	0
Advisory Council on the Treatment of Offenders	18	1
Civil Defence—Rescue Advisory Committee	7	0
Civil Defence—Training Advisory Panel	8	3
Civil Defence—Industrial Advisory Panel	7	0
Home Office—Gas Cylinders and Containers Committee	3	8
Standing Inter-Departmental Committee on Hydrogen Cyanide (Fumigation) Act, 1937 (Hydrogen Cyanide (Fumigation) Act, 1937)	1	9

## MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT (II)

	Non-official	Official
Central Housing Advisory Committee (Housing Act, 1957, Sec. 143)	30	2
Central Advisory Water Committee (Water Act, 1945, Sec. 2)	27	2
Advisory Committee on Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest (Town and Country Planning Act, 1957, Sec. 30 (5))	13	0
Standing Technical Committee on Synthetic Detergents	9	6
Technical Committee on Stormwater Overflows and the Disposal of Stormwater	9	6
Committee on the Rating of Plant and Machinery (Rating and Valuation Act, 1925, Sec. 24 (6))	5	0
Committee on the Rating of Charities	5	0
Clean Air Council (Clean Air Act, 1956, Sec. 23)	29	3
Advisory Committee on Ironstone Restoration (Mineral Workings Act, 1951, Sec. 34)	4	4
Standing Conference on Ironstone (Landowners)	17	5
Council for Wales and Monmouthshire	28	0

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Food Hygiene Advisory Council	18	0
Health and Welfare of Handicapped Persons Advisory Committee	20	0
Radioactive Substances Committee	20	1
National Consultative Council on the Recruitment of Nurses and Midwives	40	3
Therapeutic Substances Committee (Therapeutic Substances Act, 1925, Sec. 4 (2))	6	1
Specialists Awards for Professional Distinction Committee	11	3

## HOME OFFICE (30)

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Protection of Birds Advisory Committee (Protection of Birds Act, 1954, Sec. 11 (1))	14	0
State Management Districts Council	6	3
Electoral Conference	16	6
Probation Advisory and Training Board	17	3
London Probation Committee	10	1
Joint Negotiating Committee for the Probation Service	11	2
Central Committee on Common Police Services	20	4
Committee of the Queen's Police Gold Medal Essay Competition	6	5
Police Promotion Examination Board	17	4
Police Council (Police Act, 1919, Sec. 4 and Para. 18 of Part 1 of the Schedule)	34	1
Police Council for Great Britain	48	6
Police College Board of Governors	13	3
Organisation of Regional Scientific Advisers for Civil Defence	41	0
Advisory Council on Child Care (Children Act, 1948, Sec. 43)	17	5
Central Training Council in Child Care	17	2
Approved Schools Central Advisory Committee	16	6
Central Fire Brigades Advisory Council	38	7
Fire Service College Board (Fire Services Act, 1947, Sec. 23)	13	3
Conference of Chief Regional Fire Officers designate	12	6
Poisons Board (Pharmacy and Poisons Act, 1933, Sec. 16)	12	7



	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Advisory Committee on the Administration of the Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876 (Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876)	11	0
London Juvenile Courts Consultative Committee	16	2
Advisory Committee for the admission of Jewish Ecclesiastical Officers to the United Kingdom	12	0
Advisory Committee on Deprivation of Citizenship (British Nationality Act, 1948, Sec. 20 (6) and (7) )	5	0
Advisory Council on the Treatment of Offenders	18	1
Civil Defence—Rescue Advisory Committee	7	0
Civil Defence—Training Advisory Panel	8	3
Civil Defence—Industrial Advisory Panel	7	0
Home Office—Gas Cylinders and Containers Committee	3	8
Standing Inter-Departmental Committee on Hydrogen Cyanide (Fumigation) Act, 1937 (Hydrogen Cyanide (Fumigation) Act, 1937)	1	9

## MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT (11)

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Central Housing Advisory Committee (Housing Act, 1957, Sec. 143)	30	2
Central Advisory Water Committee (Water Act, 1945, Sec. 2)	27	2
Advisory Committee on Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest (Town and Country Planning Act, 1957, Sec. 30 (5) )	13	0
Standing Technical Committee on Synthetic Detergents	9	6
Technical Committee on Stormwater Overflows and the Disposal of Stormwater	9	6
Committee on the Rating of Plant and Machinery (Rating and Valuation Act, 1925, Sec. 24 (6) )	5	0
Committee on the Rating of Charities	5	0
Clean Air Council (Clean Air Act, 1956, Sec. 23)	29	3
Advisory Committee on Ironstone Restoration (Mineral Workings Act, 1951, Sec. 34)	4	4
Standing Conference on Ironstone (Landowners)	17	5
Council for Wales and Monmouthshire	28	0

## CENTRAL OFFICE OF INFORMATION (4)

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Advisory Committee for Appointment of Advertising Agents	4	1
Advisory Panel for Industrial Films	5	10
North East Overseas Publicity Advisory Committee	3	7
Welsh Overseas Publicity Advisory Committee	5	7

## MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND NATIONAL SERVICE (39)

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
National Joint Advisory Council	40	2
Joint Consultative Committee	16	2
National Advisory Council on the Employment of the Disabled	29	1
(Disabled Persons (Employment) Act, 1944, Sec. 17)		
Advisory Council on Relationship between Employment in the Services and Civilian Life	20	10
National Advisory Committee on the Employment of Older Men and Women	18	10
(Employment and Training Act, 1948, Sec. 1 (2))		
Women's Consultative Committee	11	2
(Set up before the Employment and Training Act, 1948, but now derives authority from Sec. 1 (2))		
National Institute of Houseworkers Advisory Council	33	1
(Set up before the Employment and Training Act, 1948, but now derives authority from Sec. 1 (2))		
Advisory Panel to consider Deferment Applications by Post-Graduate Students	4	2
Technical Personnel Committee	7	11
Physics and Mathematics Advisory Panel	13	3
Mechanical Engineering Committee	11	1
Electrical Engineering Advisory Committee	9	4
Civil Engineering Advisory Committee	10	1
Architecture and Public Utilities Advisory Committee	12	1
Industrial Health Advisory Committee	20	13
Cost of Living Advisory Committee	9	8
Retail Prices Index Technical Committee	2	6
Industrial Rehabilitation Development Committee	2	4
Inter-Departmental Committee on Industrial Safety Research	7	2

	Non- Official	Official
Committee on Safety, Health and Welfare in the Pottery Industry	11	3
Joint Standing Committee for the Pottery Industry	11	5
Joint Standing Committee for the Drop Forging Industry	8	2
Joint Standing Committee for the Jute Industry	"	3
Main Joint Standing Committee for the Wool Textile Industry	10	4
Joint Standing Committee for the Wool Industry for Scotland	3	2
Joint Standing Committee for the Cotton Spinning Section of the Industry	17	4
Joint Standing Committee on Cotton Weaving	18	5
Loom Fencing Committee—Sub-Committee of the Joint Standing Committee on Cotton Weaving	9	6
Joint Advisory Committee on Foundry Goggles	10	4
Joint Standing Committee on Conditions in Iron Foundries	9	4
Joint Standing Committee on Safety, Health and Welfare Conditions in Non-Ferrous Foundries	14	4
Joint Standing Committee on Conditions in Steel Foundries	12	4
Joint Standing Committee on Safety in the Use of Power Presses	5	4
Joint Standing Committee for Prevention of Accidents in Paper Mills	6	2
Joint Advisory Committee for the Cotton Industry	9	4
Advisory Panel on Radiological Problems in Industry	20	6
Advisory Panel on Dermatological Problems in Industry	9	7
Advisory Panel on Ophthalmological Problems arising in Industry	12	4
Advisory Committee on Safety and Health in the Building and Civil Engineering Industries	9	2

## LORD CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE (1)

Advisory Committee on Legal Aid and Advice  
(Legal Aid and Advice Act, 1949, Sec. 13)

## LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL

## CENTRAL OFFICE OF INFORMATION (4)

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Advisory Committee for Appointment of Advertising Agents	4	1
Advisory Panel for Industrial Films	5	10
North East Overseas Publicity Advisory Committee	3	7
Welsh Overseas Publicity Advisory Committee	5	7

## MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND NATIONAL SERVICE (39)

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
National Joint Advisory Council	40	2
Joint Consultative Committee	16	2
National Advisory Council on the Employment of the Disabled	29	1
(Disabled Persons (Employment) Act, 1944, Sec. 17)		
Advisory Council on Relationship between Employment in the Services and Civilian Life	20	10
National Advisory Committee on the Employment of Older Men and Women	18	10
(Employment and Training Act, 1948, Sec. 1 (2))		
Women's Consultative Committee	11	2
(Set up before the Employment and Training Act, 1948, but now derives authority from Sec. 1 (2))		
National Institute of Houseworkers Advisory Council	33	1
(Set up before the Employment and Training Act, 1948, but now derives authority from Sec. 1 (2))		
Advisory Panel to consider Deferment Applications by Post-Graduate Students	4	2
Technical Personnel Committee	7	11
Physics and Mathematics Advisory Panel	13	3
Mechanical Engineering Committee	11	1
Electrical Engineering Advisory Committee	9	4
Civil Engineering Advisory Committee	10	1
Architecture and Public Utilities Advisory Committee	12	1
Industrial Health Advisory Committee	20	13
Cost of Living Advisory Committee	9	8
Retail Prices Index Technical Committee	2	6
Industrial Rehabilitation Development Committee	2	4
Inter-Departmental Committee on Industrial Safety Research	7	2

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Industrial Coal Consumers' Council ( <i>Coal Industry Nationalisation Act, 1946, Sec. 4</i> )	25	0
Informal Committee with the DSIR for the Supervision of Research Work on Dust Explosions in Factories	3	7
Joint Committee with Central Electricity Generating Board on Gas Turbine Development	2	5
Joint Committee with NCB on Gas Turbine Projects	5	3
Mining Qualifications Board ( <i>Mines and Quarries Act, 1954, Sec. 148</i> )	8	1
National Joint Pneumoconiosis Committee	5	8
Oil Companies Technical Committee	4	1
Oil Consumers' Council	33	0
Safety in Mines Research (Advisory) Board	11	2
Scientific Advisory Council	9	2
Standing Advisory Committee on Oil Synthesis Research and Development Work	4	4
Standing Departmental Committee on Accidental Deaths from Gas Poisoning	5	7
Working Party on Gasification	3	3

## MINISTRY OF SUPPLY (41)

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Advisory Council on Scientific Research and Technical Development	14	7
Aeronautical Research Council	11	11
Inter-Service Metallurgical Research Council	13	13
Joint Service Materials (Non-Metallic) Advisory Board	6	9
Aero-engine Lubricating Oil Committee	16	13
Aero-engine Test Plant Committee	6	4
Aero-tyre Advisory Committee	3	11
Aircraft Steels Panel	9	6
Airworthiness Joint Standing Committee	11	13
Ammunition Production Consultative Committee	10	10
Aviation Fuel Committee	19	14
Boundary Layer Control Committee	11	10
Die Casting Advisory Committee	4	18
Electrical Components Research and Development Com- mittee	n.a.	n.a.
Explosives Storage and Transport Committee	n.a.	n.a.
Technical Advisory Committee on Use of Man-made Fibres in Service Clothing and General Stores	5	11

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Scientific Library and Technical Information Committee	5	6
Overseas Scientific Relations Committee	3	5
Natural Resources (Technical) Committee	14	2
Biology and Allied Sciences Committee	7	1

## MINISTRY OF PENSIONS AND NATIONAL INSURANCE (4)

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
National Insurance Advisory Committee (National Insurance Act, 1946, Sec. 41)	9	0
Industrial Injuries Advisory Council (National Insurance (Industrial Injuries) Act, 1946, Sec. 41)	16	0
Central Advisory Committee on War Pensions (War Pensions Act, 1921, Sec. 3)	27	2
Special Grants Committee (Naval and Military War Pensions (Transfer of Powers) Act, 1917, Sec. 2)	7	0

## POST OFFICE (5)

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Post Office Advisory Council	19	4
Television Advisory Committee	8	3
Postmaster General's Advisory Committee on Wireless Interference (Wireless Telegraphy Act, 1949, Sec. 9)	58	0
Postmaster General's Advisory Committee to hear appeals from Wireless Operators (Wireless Telegraphy Act, 1949, First Schedule)	3	0
Frequency Advisory Committee	14	12

## MINISTRY OF POWER (18)

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Advisory Committee on Rescue Work and Rescue Apparatus	1	7
Domestic Coal Consumers' Council (Coal Industry Nationalisation Act, 1946, Sec. 4)	30	0
Electrical Measurement Technical Advisory Committee	8	2
Explosives in Mines Research Committee	3	6
Fuel Efficiency Advisory Committee	7	1

	Non- official	Official
Committee on Tourist Facilities	9	20
Cinematograph Films Council (Cinematograph Films Acts, 1938/48)	22	0
Selection Committee under the Cinematograph Films Act, 1948 ( <i>Cinematograph Films Act, 1948, Sec. 5</i> )	9	0
Scrap Advisory Committee	25	10
Non-Ferrous Metals Consultative Committee	14	0
Machine Tool Advisory Council	10	9
National Advisory Council for the Motor Manufacturing Industry	13	4
Roll Committee	11	1
Diamond Die Committee	6	2
Engineering Advisory Council	22	1
Gauge and Tool Advisory Council	15	12
Hand Tool Committee	8	3
Instrument Industry Committee	8	5
Insurance Consultative Committee	7	0
Companies Act General Consultative Committee	10	2
Companies Act Accountancy Advisory Committee	5	0
Insurance Consultative Committee	9	1
Trade and Merchandise Marks Committee of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce (Trade Marks Act, 1938, Sec. 39 (9) )	12	1
Standing Committee Merchandise Marks Act (Merchandise Marks Act, 1926)	4	0
Dyestuffs Advisory Committee	9	3
Rubber Consultative Committee	13	12
Paint Advisory Committee	15	3
China Clay Council	12	0
Working Group on Exports of Reading Matter	7	14
Flax Research Committee	4	8
Netting Trade Advisory Committee	7	2
Council of Industrial Design	25	0
Council of Industrial Design (Scottish Committee)	16	0
Monopolies Commission (Monopolies and Restrictive Practices Act, 1948)	9	0
Advisory Committee on the Census of Production (Statistics of Trade Act, 1947)	3	13

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Problems of Flutter and Vibration Committee	17	10
Gas Turbine Collaboration Committee	16	16
Land Mine Detection Sub-Committee	3	6
Lubricant (Engine Testing) Advisory Panel	4	8
Manual Control Committee	8	13
Air Launched Guided Weapons Modifications Committee	3	0
Surface Launched Guided Weapons Modifications Committee	8	0
Ordnance Board	16	25
Inter-Departmental Packaging Co-ordinating Committee	2	14
Pneumatic Tyre Committee	8	2
Radio Components Research and Development Technical Committee	1	12
Royal Ordnance Factories Board	4	6
Rotating Wing Committee	8	9
Solid Tyre and Rubber Committee	4	2
Steel Castings Armament Advisory Panel	6	2
Swept Wings Advisory Committee	19	9
Tank and Aircraft Armour Advisory Committee	14	4
Tank Armour Electrode Technical Committee	9	3
M.o.S. Technical Advisory Group on Titanium	12	13
Committee to Co-ordinate Information on Aircraft Structural Uses of Titanium	23	9
Transport Aircraft Requirements Committee	5	8
Transport Aircraft Technical Committee	5	10
Development of Visual Aids to Approach and Landing Advisory Committee	10	11
Weapons Production Consultative Committee	8	9
M.o.S. Wrought Light Alloys Advisory Panel	17	6

## BOARD OF TRADE (38)

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Advisory Council on Middle East Trade	10	5
Consultative Committee for Industry	20	10
Advisory Council on Overseas Construction	12	6
Advisory Committee on Commercial Information Overseas	7	8
Exhibitions Advisory Committee	8	4
Consultative Committee on the Duty Free Entry of Machinery	7	1
Tobacco Manufacturers Advisory Committee	8	0
Advisory Committee on Revolving Fund for Industry	7	0



	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Standing Advisory Committee on the Pay of the Higher Civil Service	6	0
Panel of Advisers who hear Appeals in Security Cases	3	0
Medical Complementing Committee	1	7
Inter-Departmental Committee on Social and Economic Research	4	10
Development Areas Treasury Advisory Committee (Distribution of Industry Act, 1945, Sec. 4)	5	0
Commonwealth Telecommunications Board	9	1
Council on Prices, Productivity and Incomes	3	0
Control Committee set up under the Agreement of 1.10.50 between H.M. Government and the Motion Picture Industry of the U.S.A. (Exchange Control Act, 1947, and Cmd. 8113)	2	2
Advisory Panel of Businessmen (O. & M.)	5	0
Reviewing Committee on Export of Works of Art	4	3
Advisory Council on Export of Works of Art	38	26
University Grants Committee	16	1
Capital Issues Committee (to advise the Treasury on applications under the Control of Borrowing Order, 1947)	7	0
Treasury Advisory Panel (to advise the Treasury on applications under Sec. 468 of the Income Tax Act, 1952)	4	0

# WAR OFFICE (13)

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Interdenominational Advisory Committee on Chaplaincy Service	10	3
Army Education Advisory Board	15	5
Engineer Advisory Board	3	9
Gas Turbine Committee	2	5
Army Health Advisory Committee	7	4
Army Medical Advisory Board	5	1
Army Nursing Advisory Board	5	1
Army Pathology Advisory Committee	8	4
Army Psychiatry Advisory Committee	5	1
Advisory Committee of Psychologists	9	1
Army Personnel Research Committee	7	3
Royal Military College of Science Advisory Council	7	8
Advisory Committee on the Territorial Army	10	3

## MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND CIVIL AVIATION (20)

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
National Civil Aviation Consultative Council	25	3
Air Transport Advisory Council (Civil Aviation Act, 1949, Sec. 12)	6	2
Standing Committee on Recruitment for Civil Aviation from the Services	3	6
Air Safety Board	4	2
United Kingdom Air Transport Facilitation Committee	4	11
Civil Aviation Radio Advisory Committee	3	10
Maritime Radio Beacon Committee	7	10
Radio Aids to Marine Navigation Application Committee	15	15
Committee on Radar Training for the Merchant Navy	12	11
Committee on Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil	17	10
Advisory Committee on Defence of Ships in Port	10	7
Standing Advisory Committee on Carriage of Dangerous Goods and Explosives in Ships	8	5
Ports Efficiency Committee	6	1
Committee of Inquiry into Inland Waterways	8	3
Railway Employment (Safety Appliances Committee) (Railway Employment (Prevention of Accidents) Act, 1900, Sec. 15)	2	2
Central Transport Consultative Committee (Transport Act, 1947, Sec. 6)	20	0
Scottish Transport Council	9	0
Committee on Road Safety	24	9
London and Home Counties Traffic Advisory Committee (London Traffic Act, 1924, Sec. 125 amended by Sec. 58 London Passenger Transport Act, 1933)	28	17
Advisory Committee on Landscape Treatment of Trunk Roads	10	1

## H.M. TREASURY (20)

	<i>Non-official</i>	<i>Official</i>
National Production Advisory Council on Industry	31	0
Economic Planning Board	7	7
Development Commission (Development and Road Improvement Funds Act, 1909)	8	0
Political Honours Scrutiny Committee	3	0
Standing Committee on Museums and Galleries	9	0
Royal Fine Art Commission	16	0

	<i>Non- official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Advisory Committee on Artificial Insemination (Agriculture (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1943, Sec. 17)	13	3
Agricultural Marketing Facilities for Scotland (Agricultural Marketing Act, 1931, Sec. 12)	5	1
Cereals Trials Advisory Committee	13	2
Consumers' Committee for Scotland (Agricultural Marketing Act, 1931, Sec. 9)	8	1
Committee of Investigation for Scotland (Agricultural Marketing Act, 1931, Sec. 9)	6	1
Hill Farming Advisory Committee for Scotland (Hill Farming Act, 1946, Sec. 32)	12	1
Licensing of Bulls Advisory Committee (Improvement of Livestock (Licensing of Bulls) Act, 1931)	9	2
Pig Improvement Advisory Committee	10	4
Potato Registration Advisory Committee	10	2
Scottish Agricultural Statistics Advisory Committee (Agriculture Act, 1947, Sec. 77)	6	0
Scottish Horticultural Advisory Committee	16	1
Scottish Poultry Advisory Committee	15	6
Scottish Standing Committee for the Calculation of the Residual Values of Fertilisers and Feedingstuffs	5	1

## SCOTTISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (2)

	<i>Non- official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Advisory Council on Education in Scotland (Education (Scotland) Act, 1946, Sec. 68)	21	0
Standing Committee on Supply and Training of Teachers for Further Education	16	0

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH FOR SCOTLAND (23)

	<i>Non- official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Scottish Health Services Council (National Health Service (Scotland) Act, 1947, Sec. 2)	35	0
Standing Medical Advisory Committee	20	0
Standing Dental Advisory Committee	12	0
Standing Nursing and Midwifery Advisory Committee	16	0
Standing Pharmaceutical Advisory Committee	10	0

## MINISTRY OF WORKS (19)

	<i>Non- official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Advisory Committee of Specialists and Sub-Contractors in the Building and Civil Engineering Industries	9	3
Advisory Council on Building Research and Development	22	9
Apprenticeship and Training Council for the Electrical Contracting Industry	15	4
Bird Sanctuaries in the Royal Parks Committee	5	1
Building and Civil Engineering Joint Advisory Committee for Wales	15	2
Joint Advisory Panel for Scotland on the Building and Civil Engineering Industries	26	12
National Consultative Council of the Building and Civil Engineering Industries	20	3
Advisory Committee on Forestry	6	1
Advisory Committee on Works of Art in the House of Commons	7	1
Scottish United Services Museum Advisory Committee	7	2
Consultative Committee for the Stone Industry	18	3
Historic Buildings Council for England (Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act, 1953)	10	2
Historic Buildings Council for Scotland (As above)	9	3
Historic Buildings Council for Wales (As above)	7	1
Ancient Monuments Board for England (Ancient Monuments Act, 1913)	13	2
Ancient Monuments Board for Wales (As above)	14	2
Ancient Monuments Board for Scotland (As above)	9	2
Osborne Consultants Committee	19	1
Osborne House Committee	9	2

## SCOTLAND

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR SCOTLAND (15)

	<i>Non- official</i>	<i>Official</i>
Scottish Agricultural Advisory Council	15	1
Scottish Agricultural Improvement Council	20	0

Non-  
official      Official

Finance Committee of the Scottish Fire Services Training School	12	4
Scottish Police Council (Police Act, 1919, Sec. 4 and 13)	23	1
Committee on Common Police Services	12	3
Board of Governors, Scottish Police College	10	2
Scottish Valuation Advisory Council (Valuation and Rating (Scotland) Act, 1956, Sec. 3)	13	0
Scottish Local Government Law Consolidation Committee	6	7
Advisory Committee on the Protection of Birds for Scotland (Protection of Birds Act, 1954, Sec. 11)	14	0
Charities Advisory Committee	4	0
Scottish Records Advisory Council (Public Records (Scotland) Act, 1937, Sec. 7)	11	1
Scottish National Portrait Gallery Advisory Committee	6	0
Herring Industry Advisory Council (Herring Industry Act, 1938, Sec. 2 (2))	31	0
Supervisory Committee for Brown Trout Research	7	3
Scottish Central Probation Council	12	0
Scottish Advisory Council on Child Care (Children Act, 1948, Sec. 44)	19	0
Electricity Consultative Council for the North of Scotland District (Electricity Act, 1947 (as amended), Sec. 7A)	10	0
Electricity Consultative Council for the South of Scotland District	10	0
Amenity Committee (Hydro-Electric Development (Scotland) Act, 1934)	3	0

	Non-official	Official
Standing Advisory Committee on Hospital and Specialist Services	27	0
Standing Advisory Committee on Local Authority Services	20	0
Standing Advisory Committee on General Practitioner Services	16	0
Standing Advisory Committee on Health Centres	4	0
Standing Advisory Committee on Health Services in the Highlands and Islands	12	0
Standing Committee on Cancer	12	0
(All these as above)		
Scottish Central Medical Recruitment Committee	15	0
Advisory Committee on Medical Research	14	0
(Scottish Board of Health Act, 1919, Sec. 2, and National Health Service (Scotland) Act, 1947, Sec. 17 (1))		
National Hospital Service Reserve—Scottish Consultative Committee	15	1
Scottish sub-committee of Awards Committee to advise the Secretary of State about merit awards to Scottish Consultants	10	1
Scottish Advisory Distribution Committee	8	0
Scottish Food Hygiene Council	17	0
(Food and Drugs (Scotland) Act, 1956, Sec. 25)		
Central Professional Committee for Opticians (Scotland)	12	0
Advisory Council on Welfare of Handicapped Persons	19	6
(National Assistance Act, 1948, Sec. 29)		
Scottish Housing Advisory Committee	18	0
(Housing (Scotland) Act, 1950, Sec. 143)		
Clean Air Council for Scotland	21	0
(Clean Air Act, 1956, Sec. 23)		
Scottish Rivers Purification Advisory Committee	17	0
(Rivers (Prevention of Pollution) (Scotland) Act, 1951, Sec. 1 (2))		
Scottish Water Advisory Committee	13	0
(Water (Scotland) Act, 1946, Sec. 1)		

## SCOTTISH HOME DEPARTMENT (23)

	Non-official	Official
Scottish Central Fire Brigades Advisory Council	24	4
(Fire Services Act, 1947, Sec. 29)		
Organisation and Training Committee of the Scottish Fire Service Training School	10	1

- Atomic Energy Authority, 138, 157  
 Attlee, C. R., 10  
 Aviation, Ministry of, 26-7, 89, 132,  
 142, 146, 155, 156, 157, 175  
*See also* Supply, Ministry of

## B

- Barlow Committee, 31  
 Barracrough, K. J. P., 45  
 Benstead, Sir John, 71, 141  
 Beveridge Broadcasting Committee, 175  
 Beveridge, Sir William, 171  
 Bevin, Ernest, 140  
 Birch, J. A., 138  
 Birds, Advisory Committee on the  
 Protection of, 30  
 Birds, Scotland, Advisory Committee  
 on Protection of, 117  
 British Broadcasting Corporation  
 (BBC), 175, 176  
 British Employers' Confederation  
 (BEC), 25, 37, 71, 75, 92, 133, 135,  
 138, 140, 141, 142, 172, 173, 194  
 British Medical Association (BMA), 65,  
 83, 93, 168  
 British Transport Commission, 26, 71,  
 141  
 British Trawlers Federation, 144  
 Brooke, Henry, 130, 131  
 Brown, Vice-Admiral Sir Harold, 45  
 Brundrett, Sir Frederick, 155  
 Building and Civil Engineering Indus-  
 tries, National Consultative  
 Council of the, 27, 33  
 Burnham Committees, 18, 29, 38, 45,  
 67, 70, 71, 132, 177-81  
 Butler, R. A., 64

## C

- Cabinet, 1, 2, 152  
 Cabinet Office, 66, 132, 137  
 Cameron, Lord, 121, 122, 123-4  
 Camping Advisory Committee, 118  
 Capital Issues Committee, 8, 13, 17  
*Careers in Education for University Grad-*  
*uates, A, 190*  
 Cart Committee, 74

- Central Office of Information (COI),  
 23, 33, 103, 206  
 Central Statistical Office, 154  
 Chairmen of advisory committees,  
 44-6, 53, 65-6, 135, 138, 141, 144,  
 146, 151, 154, 157, 158, 159, 161,  
 162, 164, 168, 175, 179, 183, 186  
 Child Care, Advisory Council on, 28,  
 30, 48, 54, 59, 62, 72, 75, 76, 77,  
 79-80, 82, 98, 102  
 Child Care, Central Training Council  
 in, 17, 30, 54  
 Child Care, Scottish Advisory Council  
 on, 34  
 Children Act (1948), 77  
 China Clay Council, 81-2  
 Cinematograph Films Council, 25, 45,  
 58 fn.  
 Citrine, Sir Walter, 133  
 Civil Aviation Consultative Council,  
 National, 26, 90  
 Civil Defence Industrial Advisory  
 Panel, 37  
 Civil servants on advisory committees,  
 15, 31, 45, 47-8, 65, 67, 68, 71, 79,  
 80, 88, 94, 95, 98, 105, 111, 138,  
 147, 151, 157, 175, 186  
 Clean Air Council, 30  
 Cleary, Sir William, 180  
 Coal Consumers' Council, Domestic,  
 19, 100  
 Coal Consumers' Council, Industrial,  
 19  
 Coates, Sir William, 175  
 Cohen of Birkenhead, Lord, 169  
 Colonial affairs, advisory committees  
 dealing with, 32-3  
 Colonial committees, 32-3  
*For individual colonial committees see*  
*under subject*  
 Colonial Office, 3, 4, 23, 32-3, 40, 56,  
 88, 132, 181, 182, 184, 185, 201-2  
 Colonial Research Council, 17, 19, 32,  
 33, 49, 51, 52, 56, 67, 69, 73, 82,  
 132, 181-5  
 Commercial Information Overseas,  
 Advisory Committee on, 25  
 Committees of Investigation, 27, 67

# INDEX

*Major references are given in bold type.*

*The lists in Special Studies IV and V are not indexed.*

## A

- Administrative duties for advisory committees, 8, 16-18, 20-1, 33, 101-2, 104, 181-5
- Admiralty, 23, 27, 147, 157, 198
- Advantages of using an advisory committee, 86-7, 88, 104
- See also Reasons for appointing advisory committees
- Advisers, informal, from outside bodies, 85-6, 87, 90
- Advisers, panels of, 88-9
- Advisers, specialist, in certain government departments, 88
- Aeronautical Research Council, 31, 53, 156
- Agenda of advisory committees, 76, 136, 139, 142, 144, 147, 161, 166
- Agricultural Advisory Committee, 5
- Agricultural Advisory Service, National, 47, 67, 95, 151
- Agricultural Economics Service, Advisory Committee on the Provincial, 27, 46, 69
- Agricultural Economists, Conference of Provincial, 27
- Agricultural Improvement Council for England and Wales, 27, 47, 52, 69, 70, 74, 75, 76, 95, 132, 148-52
- Agricultural Improvement Council for Scotland, 76, 148, 149, 151
- Agricultural Machinery Advisory Committee, Colonial, 33
- Agricultural Marketing Acts, 27
- Agricultural Research Committee, Colonial, 183
- Agricultural Research Council, 19, 24, 32, 73, 76, 95, 149, 150, 153
- Agricultural Statistics Advisory Committee, 27, 67
- Agricultural Wages Board, 5
- Agriculture, Animal Health and Forestry, Colonial Advisory Council on, 181-2, 183
- Agriculture, Board of, 5
- Agriculture, Council of, for England, 5
- Agriculture, Department of, for Scotland, 23, 76, 122, 214, 215
- Agriculture, Fisheries, and Food, Ministry of, 17, 23, 27-8, 46, 56, 67, 73, 76, 78, 88, 132, 135, 144, 147, 148, 150, 151, 198-201
- Air Cadet Council, 31
- Air Ministry, 23, 31, 53, 157, 201
- Air Safety Board, 17, 27
- Air Transport Advisory Council, 17, 26, 53, 58 fn., 63, 83
- Amenity Committee, 119, 120
- Ancient Monuments Boards, 20, 33, 116
- Appleton, Sir Edward, 190
- Appointment of members of advisory committees, 37, 153, 184
- Army Education Advisory Board, 31
- Art, Advisory Council on Export of Works of, 51, 83
- Art, Committee on Works of, in the House of Commons, 33
- Artificial Insemination, Central Advisory Committee on, 28, 46
- Assistant Masters, Incorporated Association of, 178
- Assistant Mistresses, Incorporated Association of, 178
- Association of British Chambers of Commerce, 92, 135, 144, 193



Education, Board of, 4, 6-7, 177

Consultative Committee of the, 6-7  
Education Committee, Welsh Joint,  
126, 164, 178

Education Committees, Association of,  
93, 164, 178, 179, 197

Education Department, Scottish, 23, 215

Education (England), Central Advisory  
Council for, 7, 13, 22, 28, 29, 40,  
45, 63, 64, 66, 70, 72-3, 80, 96, 116

Education for Industry and Commerce,  
National Advisory Council on, 29,  
51, 118, 164

Education in Scotland, Advisory Coun-  
cil on, 34, 118, 119

Education in the Colonies, Advisory  
Committee on, 32, 74

Education, Ministry of, 23, 29, 38, 63,  
132, 147, 148, 154, 163, 187, 202-3

Education (Wales), Central Advisory  
Council for, 28, 29, 116

Edwards, Alderman Huw, 126, 128,  
129, 130

Effectiveness of advisory committees,  
9, 96-103, 124

*See also* Influence of advisory com-  
mittees

Employers on advisory committees, 15,  
24, 32, 41, 42, 55, 68, 71, 72, 79,  
92, 135, 138, 140, 144, 146, 147,  
148, 172, 186, 187

Employment of the Disabled, National  
Advisory Council on the, 25, 62

Engineering Advisory Council (EAC),  
13, 15, 24, 38, 42, 59, 62, 68, 72, 84,  
132, 145-8, 186-8

Engineering Industries Association, 147

Entomological Research Committee, 3

Examinations Council, Secondary  
Schools, 29, 118

Exchequer, Chancellor of the, 66, 81,  
134, 135, 136, 137, 141

Exhibitions Committee, 25

Expenses of members, 53, 65, 158

Expert committees, 3, 4, 14, 16, 18, 19,  
20, 51, 72, 101, 110, 155, 159

Export Credits Guarantee Department,  
24

## F

Farm Improvement Scheme, Advisory  
Committee on, 28

Federation of British Industries (FBI),  
84, 92, 133, 135, 138, 143, 144, 148,  
190, 194

Fees to members, 52-3, 65, 158

*Fifteen to Eighteen*, 80

Fire Brigades Advisory Council, Cen-  
tral, 30, 117

Fire Brigades Advisory Council, Cen-  
tral, Scottish, 117

Fire Brigades Unions, 117

Fire Officers' Association, Chief, 117

Fire Officers, National Association of, 117

Fire Service College Board, 30

Fish Authority, White, 122, 123, 124

Fish Industry Advisory Council, White,  
28, 58 fn.

Fisheries Committee, 119-20

Flying Personnel Research Committee,  
31

Food and Drug Acts, 28

Food Hygiene Advisory Council, 29

Food, Infestation of, Joint Standing  
Consultative Committee on the, 28

Food Standards Advisory Committee,  
28, 45, 83

Food Survey Committee, National, 28,  
83

Foreign Office, 22, 103, 154

Forestry, Advisory Committee on, 34

Forestry Commission, 24, 122

Franks Committee, 143

Frequency Advisory Committee, 34

Friendly Societies, 41, 172

Fuel Efficiency Advisory Committee,  
25

## G

Garro-Jones, G., 175

Gas Turbine Committee, 31

General Agreement on Tariffs and  
Trade (GATT), 72, 79, 143, 145

General Medical Council, 168

General Post Office. *See* Post Office

General Register Office, 24

Commons, House of, 58, 81, 185, 188, 191  
 Disqualification Act, 58, 58 fn.  
 Commonwealth Affairs, Advisory Committee dealing with, 33  
 Commonwealth Relations Office, 23, 33, 202  
 Composition of advisory committees, 35-60  
 Confidence, rules of, 43, 44, 102, 108, 123  
 Confidential nature of proceedings, 76-7, 82, 108-9, 123, 139, 148, 154, 158  
 Consultative Committee for Industry (CCI), 24, 37, 42, 55, 62, 72, 79, 82, 132, 143-5  
 Consultative committees, 14, 15-16, 18, 51, 62, 63, 68, 71-2, 87, 89-90, 99-100, 110, 139  
 Consumer committees, 19-20, 100  
 Consumers' Committee for England and Wales, 27, 67  
 Consumers' Committee for Great Britain, 27, 67  
 Co-operation in the Colonies, Advisory Committee on, 32  
 Co-operative Union, Ltd., 144  
 Co-ordination between advisory committees, 76, 149-50, 151, 155, 174, 182, 184  
 Cotton Board, 89  
 Cotton Industry Advisory Committee, 8  
 Counties of Cities Association, 117, 120  
 Country Landowners Association, 93  
 County Councils' Association, 54, 91, 93, 117, 120, 164, 178, 196-7  
 Cripps, Sir Stafford, 133, 137  
 Cromwell, Oliver, 3  
 Crowther, Sir Geoffrey, 45, 63  
 Cruelty to Animals Act (1876), Advisory Committee on, 4, 30, 62  
 Cunningham, Sir Graham, 138  
 Currency Boards, East African and West African, 17, 33  
 Customs and Excise, 22, 144

## D

Daniel, Admiral Sir Charles, 45, 175  
 Defence, Ministry of, 22, 31, 103, 152  
 Defence Research Policy Committee, 31, 56, 152, 153, 155  
 Deferment Applications by Post-graduate Students, Advisory Panel to Consider, 17  
 Dental Manpower Committee, 29  
 Dental Standing Advisory Committee, 28  
 Department of Scientific and Industrial Research (DSIR), 19, 24, 32, 47, 51, 51 fn., 153, 157, 176, 183  
 Departmental committees, 22-4  
 Development Areas Treasury Advisory Committee, 17  
 Development Commission, 17, 58 fn.  
 Development of advisory committees, I-II  
 Devons, Professor Ely, 107  
 Directorate of Scientific Research, 156  
 Directors, Institute of, 93  
 Discussion in committees, conduct of, 70-2  
 Distribution, Census of, 25  
 Dollar Exports Council, 20  
 Drop Forging Industry, Joint Standing Committee for the, 25  
 Duplication of membership. *See* Plurality of membership

## E

Early advisory committees, I-3  
*Early Leaving*, 80  
 Economic Advisory Committee, Colonial, 182  
 Economic Advisory Council, 9, 14  
 Economic Affairs, Minister for, 134, 137  
 Economic and industrial committees, 24-7  
 Economic Planning Board, 15, 24, 44, 49, 64, 66, 71, 77, 78, 79, 84, 89, 97, 132, 137-40  
 Education Act (1899), 6  
 Education Act (1944), 177  
 Education, advisory committees dealing with, 29

Ironstone Restoration, Advisory Committee on, 53

## J

Jewish Ecclesiastical Officers, Advisory Committee for the Admission of, to the United Kingdom, 17, 30  
 Joint Advisory Committee, Central (1941), 133  
 Joint Consultative Committee, 75, 142  
 Jones, W. E., 138

## L

Labour Advisory Committee, Colonial, 32  
 Labour and National Service, Ministry of, 13, 17, 23, 25, 37, 47, 58 fn., 59, 62, 116, 122, 132, 135, 139, 141, 147, 171, 190, 206-7  
 Land Pests Advisory Committee, 115  
 Land Registry, 24  
 Law, Committee on Native, 33  
 Lee, Miss Jennie, 82  
 Lee of Fareham, Lord, 5, 6  
 Legal Aid and Advice Act, Advisory Committee on, 22, 34, 72, 80, 88, 102  
 Local Government Audit Fees Committee, 120, 121  
 Local government connections with advisory committees, 5, 29, 30, 38, 55, 91, 93, 100, 117, 122, 125, 126, 161, 165, 166, 168, 189, 191  
 London County Council, 164, 178  
 Lord Chancellor, 23, 34, 72, 80, 88, 207  
 Lord President of the Council, 23, 125, 155, 207-8  
 Lord Privy Seal, 155  
 Lords, House of, 60  
 Lytleton, Oliver, 133

## M

Machine Tool Advisory Council, 24, 38, 45, 46, 67, 72, 74-5, 84, 146  
 Machine Tool Trades Association, 34, 84

Macmillan, Harold, 78, 128, 129, 130  
 McNair Report, 163  
 Makins, Sir Roger, 138  
 Mansergh, N. S., 9  
 Maude, Sir John, 180  
 Medical Manpower Committee, National, 29  
 Medical Research Committee, 7  
 Medical Research Committee, Colonial, 67, 70, 183  
 Medical Research Council, 19, 24, 32, 101, 153  
 Medical Standing Advisory Committee, 28  
 Meetings, frequency of, 22, 26, 34, 65, 69-70, 127, 138, 142, 144, 147, 151, 154, 158, 160, 161, 166, 169, 172, 176, 179, 184, 186  
 Membership of advisory committees, 34, 35, 135, 137-8, 140-2, 144, 146-7, 150-1, 153, 156-8, 160-1, 164-5, 167-8, 172, 175-6, 178-9, 183-4  
 appointment of substitutes to, 135, 141, 165  
 co-option to, 56-7, 161, 165  
 internal balance of, 35-6, 40, 48-9, 51, 57  
 lay, 46, 55, 57, 92  
 need for confidence in, 39-40, 41, 44, 174  
 size of, 51-2, 68-9, 133, 135, 137, 139, 140, 141, 144, 146, 150, 153, 157, 161, 164, 167-8, 172, 178, 179, 183, 184  
 three main types of, 37-8, 38-40, 40-1  
 willingness to accept, 52, 158  
*See also Chairmen and Secretaries*  
 Merchandise Marks Act, 78  
 Merchandise Marks Standing Committee, 78  
 Merchant Shipping Acts, 4  
 Merchant Shipping Advisory Committee, 4  
 Merchants, Authorisation of, Advisory Panel, 17  
 Messer, Sir Frederick, 168

*Government Administration in Wales*,  
127, 128-9, 130  
Government departments which do not  
have advisory committees, 22  
Grimston, J., 59  
Groves, Ronald, 45  
Growth of advisory committees, 9-11

## H

Hadow Report (1926), 7  
Haldane Committee on the Machinery  
of Government, 6, 9, 61  
Handicapped Children, Advisory Com-  
mittee on, 29, 118  
Hankey Television Committee, 174  
Headmasters, Incorporated Association  
of, 178  
Headmistresses, Incorporated Associa-  
tion of, 178  
Health, advisory committees dealing  
with, 28-9  
Health, Department of, for Scotland,  
23, 34, 215-16  
Health, Ministry of, 23, 29, 39, 51, 56,  
93, 132, 167, 203-4  
Health Services Council, Central  
(CHSC), 16, 22, 28, 37, 39, 50,  
51, 59, 65, 66, 68, 74, 76, 83, 93,  
98-9, 132, 167-71  
Health Services Council, Scottish, 34,  
76, 169  
Health, Welsh Board of, 127  
Herring Industry Board, 122, 124  
Highlands and Islands of Scotland,  
Advisory Panel on the, 59, 121-5  
Hill Farming Advisory Committee for  
England, Wales, and Northern  
Ireland, 67, 115, 116  
Sub-committee for Wales and Mon-  
mouthshire, 116  
Hill Farming Advisory Committee for  
Scotland, 116, 118  
Historic Buildings Councils, 20, 23, 101  
Home affairs, advisory committees  
dealing with, 30  
Home Department, Scottish, 23, 34,  
122, 123, 216-17

Home Office, 4, 23, 37, 34-5, 56, 79,  
82, 93, 157, 204-5  
Housing Act (1935), 159, 160  
Housing Advisory Committee, Cen-  
tral, 13, 28, 30, 39, 50, 51, 59, 63,  
67, 73, 74, 80, 81, 82, 88, 97, 101,  
132, 159-63  
Housing Advisory Committee, Scottish,  
74  
Housing and Local Government, Minis-  
try of, 23, 30, 53, 73, 93, 127, 128,  
130, 132, 135, 159, 205  
Hughes, Emrys, 78  
Hughes-Parry, Sir David, 180  
Hydro-Electric Board, North of Scot-  
land, 119, 124  
Hydro-Electric Development (Scot-  
land) Act (1943), 119

## I

Import Duties Act (1958), 8  
Import Duties Advisory Committee,  
7-8  
Independence of certain committees,  
7-8, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20-1, 22, 98  
Independent Television Authority  
(ITA), 175, 176  
India, Council of the Secretary of State  
for, 4-5  
Indian Civil Service, 5  
Industrial Association of Wales, 126  
Industrial Design, Council of, 20  
Industrial Disputes Order, 81  
Industrial Films, Advisory Panel for, 33  
Industrial Health Advisory Committee,  
25  
Industrial Injuries Advisory Council,  
31, 53, 58 fn., 73, 76, 102, 174  
Infestation Control Division, 115  
Influence of advisory committees, 74-5,  
96-113, 143, 148, 152, 155, 159,  
162-3, 167, 170-1, 185  
Inland Revenue, Board of, 22, 103  
Instrument Industry Committee, 24  
Interest groups, 41, 91-4, 105, 106, 193  
Iron and Steel Board, 71, 89, 135, 147,  
186

Offenders in the Colonies, Advisory Committee on Treatment of, 33  
 Oil and Fats Advisory Panel, 68  
 Oil Consumers' Council, 19, 26  
 Organisation for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC), 143, 145, 154  
 Oversea Migration Board, 33, 83  
 Overseas Construction, Advisory Council on, 25  
 Overseas Research Council, 32, 182

## P

Paint Advisory Council, 90  
 Palmer, Sir William, 144  
 Papers of advisory committees, 68, 70, 76-7, 136, 138, 142, 148, 151, 155, 161, 166, 184, 187, 188  
 Parliament, Houses of, 80, 83, 84, 105-7, 124, 161, 173, 174  
 Parliament, Members of, 58-60, 122, 127, 128, 129, 172  
 Paymaster General's Office, 135, 144  
 Payment of members of advisory committees. *See* Fees to members and Expenses of members  
 Peat Committee, Scottish, 120, 121  
 Pensions and national insurance, advisory committees dealing with, 31  
 Pensions and National Insurance, Ministry of, 23, 132, 171, 173, 208  
 Period of service on advisory committees, 49-50, 138, 141, 147, 151, 153, 157, 161, 165, 168, 172, 183  
 Petroleum Industry Advisory Council, 20  
 Pitt, William, 2, 3  
 Plowden, Lord, 138  
 Plurality of membership, 53-8, 108, 109, 111  
 Poisons Board, 30, 45, 67  
 Police College Board of Governors, 30  
 Police Council, 18, 45, 54, 79, 118  
 Police Council for Great Britain, 18, 30, 38, 45, 54, 67, 70, 71, 79  
 Police Council, Scottish, 117, 118  
 Political Honours Scrutiny Committee, 17, 37, 78, 102

Political system, function of advisory committees in the, 8, 60, 81, 86, 103-7, 112-13, 130-1  
*See also* Advantages of using an advisory committee  
 Pollock, Sir George, 140  
 Pollution of the Sea by Oil, Committee on the Prevention of, 47  
 Ports Efficiency Committee, 67  
 Post Office, 23, 34, 67, 103, 132, 174, 175, 176, 208  
 Post Office Advisory Council, 34  
 Pottery Industry, Joint Standing Committee for the, 25  
 Poultry (Stock Improvement) Advisory Committee, 69  
 Power, Ministry of, 23, 25-6, 32, 135, 208, 209  
 Press, connections with the, 15, 84, 123, 136, 139, 142, 158, 162, 167, 173, 176  
 Pressure groups. *See* Interest groups  
 Prices, Productivity and Incomes, Council on, 20, 80, 97  
 Principals of Technical Institutions, Association of, 164  
 Privy Council, 2, 7, 73  
 Probation Service, Joint Negotiating Committee for the, 30  
 Procedure, informal, of certain committees. *See* Discussion in committees, conduct of  
 Production, Census of, 4, 25  
 Production, Ministry of, 133, 134  
 Productivity Council, British, 20  
 Public Record Office, 24  
 Publicity for work of advisory committees, 20, 80-1, 83, 84, 97, 109, 110, 148, 155, 162, 166, 173, 174, 176  
*See also* Press, connections with the  
 Purpose of advisory committees, 12, 24

Q

Quasi-judicial advisory committees, 17-18, 101-2

R

Radio Industry Council, 175

- Metallurgical Research Council, Inter-Service, 31, 53, 156  
 Meteorological Research Committee, 53  
 Middle East Trade, Advisory Council on, 20, 25  
 Milk and Milk Products Technical Advisory Committee, 83  
 Minority reports of advisory committees, 82, 110, 174, 176  
 Mint, the Royal, 24  
 Minutes of advisory committees, 15, 16, 66, 76, 82, 101, 116, 123, 136, 139, 145, 148, 152, 158, 161, 165, 166, 173  
 Monopolies Commission, 20, 58  
 Morris, Sir Philip, 165  
 Morrison of Lambeth, Lord, 59, 125, 127, 137  
 Motor Manufacturers and Traders, Society of, 38  
 Motor Manufacturing Industry, National Advisory Council for the, 24, 38, 42, 46, 59, 67, 68, 83, 84, 146  
 Municipal Corporations, Association of, 54, 91, 93, 164, 178, 196

## N

- National and Local Government Officers' Association (NALGO), 93, 141  
 National Chamber of Trade, 92  
 National Debt Commissioners, 3  
 National Eisteddfod, Welsh, 125, 126  
 National Farmers' Union, 27, 93, 126, 135, 141, 144, 150, 196  
 National Health Service Act (1946), 28, 39, 167, 169  
 National Industrial Council for Wales and Monmouthshire, 126  
 National Insurance Act (1911), 7  
 National Insurance Act (1946), 171, 172  
 National Insurance Advisory Committee, 13, 22, 28, 31, 41, 50, 51, 53, 56, 58 fn., 62-3, 70, 73, 76, 77, 80, 102, 132, 171-4

- National Joint Advisory Council (NJAC), 13, 24, 25, 37-8, 42, 52, 59, 62, 68, 69, 71, 72, 74, 75, 81, 83, 84, 93, 132, 139, 140-43  
 National Production Advisory Council on Industry (NPACI), 15, 24, 37, 42, 50, 52, 59, 62, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 75, 76, 78, 79, 81, 84, 89, 93, 108, 109, 115, 132, 133-7, 138, 140  
 National Savings Committee, 10, 20, 24  
 National Union of Agricultural Workers, 150  
 National Union of Manufacturers, 92, 135, 144, 194-5  
 National Union of Teachers, 93, 164, 178, 179, 188, 197  
 Nationalised industries, representation of, on advisory committees, 19, 25, 38, 71, 75, 100, 126, 135, 140, 141, 142  
 Nature Conservancy, 19, 24, 32, 116, 153  
 Naval Chaplaincy Service, Advisory Committee on the, 31  
 Negotiating committees, 18, 38, 42, 45, 67, 71, 78, 102, 104, 177-81  
*New Statesman*, 53  
 Non-ferrous Metals Consultative Committee, 59  
 North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), 134  
 Northern Ireland, 67, 76, 115, 116, 135, 172  
 Number of committees, 9-11, 22-4, 34  
 Nurses and Midwives, National Consultative Council on the Recruitment of, 29

## O

- O'Brien, Sir Tom, 59  
 Oceanographic and Meteorological Research, Advisory Committee on, 67  
 Offenders, Advisory Committee on the Treatment of, 30, 62, 68, 70

Ships, Committee on the Carriage of Dangerous Goods and Explosives in, 26, 70

Ships Replacement Committee, 8

Ship's Wireless Working Party, 26

Smallholdings Advisory Council, 28, 150

Social and Economic Research, Inter-departmental Committee on, 47

Social Development in the Colonies, Advisory Committee on, 16, 32-3, 40, 50, 82

Social Science Research Council, Colonial, 82

Social service committees, 28-31, 88

Social Survey, the, 72, 162

Society of Medical Officers of Health, 168

*South Wales Ports*, 127

Specialists, potential power of, 95, 102

Spens Report, 7

Spindles Board, Advisory Committee to the, 8

State Management Districts Council, 17, 30

Stationery Office, H.M., 22, 103

Status of advisory committees, 111-12

Statutory committees, 4, 21-2, 62, 65, 78, 96-7, 177-8

Stone Industry Consultative Committee, 33

Structure of advisory committees, 61-9

Students, Colonial, in the U.K., Consultative Committee on the Welfare of, 33

Sub-committees of advisory committees, 69, 70, 73, 74-6, 122, 126, 127, 142, 143, 145, 151-2, 153-4, 157-8, 161-2, 165-6, 169, 176-7, 179-80, 183

Sugar Beet Research and Education Committee, 67

Supply, Ministry of, 19, 23, 31, 44, 50, 52, 53, 56, 67, 90, 95, 145, 146, 147, 155, 156, 187, 209-10

*See also* Aviation, Ministry of

## T

Teachers, Departmental Committee on the Supply of, in Scotland, 118, 119

Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education, Association of, 164, 179

Teachers in Technical Institutions, Association of, 164, 178, 179

Teachers, National Advisory Council on Training and Supply of, 16, 29, 38, 46, 63, 65, 69, 74, 80, 82-3, 88, 93, 118, 132, 163-7, 188-92

Teachers, Standing Committee on Supply and Training of, for Further Education, 118, 119

Technical Institutions, Association of, 164

Technical Personnel Committee, 58 fn.

Technical subjects, committees on, 28, 30

Television Advisory Committee, 34, 41, 45, 46, 64, 67, 81, 82, 101, 132, 174-7

Terms of reference of advisory committees, 62-5, 133, 134, 137, 140, 143, 146, 149, 150, 152, 156, 160, 163, 167, 172, 175, 177-8, 182

Tewson, Sir Vincent, 138, 141

Tizard, Sir Henry, 152

Todd, Sir Alexander, 153, 154

Topics considered by advisory committees, 64, 81, 106-7, 112, 130, 139, 142-4, 145, 155, 186-8

Tourist and Holidays Board, Welsh, 125, 126

Tourist Board, Scottish, 122, 124

Trade associations, representation of, on advisory committees, 15, 55, 67, 74, 92, 93, 147, 175

Trade, Board of, 2, 3, 4, 8, 20, 23, 24-5, 37, 54, 55, 59, 66, 67, 84, 89, 90, 92, 122, 132, 133, 134, 137, 142, 143, 144, 145, 147, 148, 162, 187, 210-11

Advisory Council, 9

President of the, 135, 144, 146, 186

- Railway Employment (Safety Appliances) Committee, 26
- Reasons for appointing advisory committees, 8, 10-11, 12-14, 79, 94-5  
*See also* Advantages of using an advisory committee
- Recommendations of advisory committees, 124, 152, 170, 173-4, 185, 188-92  
*See also* Effectiveness of advisory committees, Influence of advisory committees, and Reports of advisory committees
- Recruitment of advisory committees, 36-42
- Regional Boards for Industry, 54, 68, 71, 79, 81, 133, 134, 135
- Rehabilitation of Marginal Land, 127
- Relations of committee members with outside groups, 42-4
- Rent Act, 81
- Reports of advisory committees, 9, 15, 16, 20, 22, 25, 34, 48, 65, 73, 80, 82-4, 87, 88, 97, 110, 111, 119, 121, 127-9, 136, 142, 154, 155, 158, 162, 166-7, 169, 170, 173, 176, 179, 188-90, 191  
*See also* Minority reports
- Research, Advisory Committee for, 7
- Research committees, 18-19, 24, 31-2, 33
- Research sponsored by committees, 19, 72-3
- Retail Prices Index Technical Committee, 47
- Road Safety, Committee on, 26
- Roberts, Sir Sydney, 45
- Rodent Control, Joint Standing Consultative Committee, 28
- Royal Colleges, 7, 37, 65, 93, 168
- Royal Society, The, 7, 154
- Rubber Consultative Council, 90
- Rural Depopulation, 127-8, 129
- Science, Minister for, 19, 31, 63, 132, 152, 153, 154, 155, 182
- Science Museum Advisory Committee, 4, 118
- Scientific Advisory Committee to the Cabinet, 152
- Scientific Policy, Advisory Council on, 31, 41, 50, 51, 56, 63, 67, 77, 80, 83, 95, 97, 102, 132, 152-5, 157, 189, 190
- Scientific Research and Technical Development, Advisory Council on (SAC), 16, 25, 40-1, 44, 50, 52, 56, 65, 66, 70, 75, 77, 82, 84, 132, 155-9
- Scientific subjects, advisory committees dealing with, 31-2
- Scotland, 59, 76, 115, 116, 117-25, 128, 172, 180, 214-17
- Scotland, Convention of Royal Burghs in, 117
- Scottish affairs, advisory committees dealing with, 34, 115-25
- Scottish committees. *For individual Scottish committees, see under subject*
- Scottish committees with English counterparts, 117-19
- Scottish committees without English counterparts, 119-20
- Scottish Council (Development and Industry), 122, 124
- Scrap Advisory Committee, 81
- Sea Defences, Advisory Committee on
- Research designed to improve, 67
- Secretariat of advisory committees, 16, 47, 66-8, 136
- Secretaries of advisory committees, 47, 65, 66, 138, 141, 151, 157, 162, 170, 173, 176, 179, 183, 184
- Selsdon Television Committee, 174
- Service departments, advisory committees of, 31, 77
- Sewer Committee, Central, 28
- Shipbuilding Advisory Committee, 27
- Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions, Confederation of, 39, 84, 92, 147, 148
- Shipping Federation, 26



Trade unionists on advisory committees, 15, 24, 32, 38, 41, 43, 55, 59, 68, 71, 72, 79, 92, 135, 138, 140, 141, 144, 146, 147, 148, 161, 172, 186, 187, 188

Trades Union Congress, 25, 26, 37, 42, 71, 75, 78, 92, 93, 133, 134, 135, 138, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 172, 173, 195

Traffic Advisory Committee, London and Home Counties, 26

Tramp Shipping Administrative Committee, 8

Transport and Civil Aviation, Ministry of, 23, 26, 27, 89, 117, 135, 212

Transport Consultative Committee, Central, 19, 26

Transport Council, Scottish, 26, 124, 116, 117

Transport Users' Consultative Committee, 26

Treasury, 7, 23, 40, 47, 51, 66, 68, 84, 111, 132, 134, 136, 137, 141, 144, 154, 175, 212-13

Panel of Advisers, 17

Development Areas Advisory Committee, 17

Tropical Africa, Advisory Medical and Sanitary Committee for, 3

Tropical Diseases Research Fund, Advisory Committee for the, 3

Trustee Savings Banks Inspection Committee, 3

Types of advisory committees, 14-18

Unemployment, 127

Unemployment Insurance Statutory Committee, 62

University Education Board of University of Wales, 164

University Grants Advisory Committee, Colonial, 17, 33

University Grants Committee, 12, 17, 29, 53, 58 fn., 153, 189

University of Wales, 126

## V

Valuation Advisory Council, 120-1

Valuation and Rating (Scotland) Act (1956), 120

Vernon, R. V., 9

Vice-Chancellors and Principals of Universities and University Colleges, Committee of, 164

Victoria and Albert Museum Advisory Committee, 4, 118

Visits of advisory committees, 70, 122-3, 151, 158

Vivisection, Royal Commission on, 4

Volume of work of advisory committees, variations in, 77-81

Voting, 48, 136, 166, 179, 180, 184

## W

Wales, 115, 125-31, 163, 172,

Wales and Monmouthshire, Council for, 13, 65, 70, 80, 83, 97, 125-31

Water Committee, Central Advisory, 22, 28, 30, 40, 48, 49, 50, 51, 59, 63, 73, 76, 78, 82, 96, 98

Waterworks Association, British, 73

War Office, 23, 31, 95, 197, 213

War Pensions, Central Advisory Committee on, 62

Weeks, Hugh, 138

Welsh Affairs, Minister for, 127, 128, 129

Welsh committees at England and Wales departments, 115-16

Wheate, Prof. K. C., 105

Whitley Councils, 18, 167, 180, 181

Williamson, Sir Thomas, 141

Wilmot, Lord, 145-6

Women members of advisory committees, 5, 49

Wool Industry for Scotland, Joint Standing Committee for the, 116

Works, Ministry of, 23, 27, 33, 89, 103, 116, 214

## Z

Zuckerman, Sir Solly, 153